The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXIII, No. 4 October, 1945

CONTENTS

"Most Consoling Intelligence from England . . ."
Edmond Darvil Benard 241

In Quest of Newman . . . . *Hugh F. Blunt* 253

Newman and Modern Educational Thought . *J. F. Leddy* 264

Newman's Spiritual Legacy to the Catholic Priest
William R. Lamm, S.M. 277

"The Salvation of the Hearer . . ."
Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P. 288

John Henry Newman and the Vatican Definition of Papal Infallibility . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 300

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1945, by The Catholic University of America Press

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN

By JOHN MOODY

AN "everyman's life of Newman by the author of THE LONG ROAD HOME. This is a true and finished portrait of that great thinker, artist of letters, and man of God. This year marks the centenary of Newman's conversion and it is particularly fitting that John Moody, who traveled the same road to conversion himself, should write this latest, swift-reading biography.

$3.75

A NEWMAN SYNTHESIS

Arranged by

ERICH PRZWARA, S. J.

AN arrangement of the great Newman passages so as to reconstruct Newman's thought, systematically and in its completeness as it was present in Newman's own mind. **$3.50**

SHEED & WARD

63 Fifth Avenue

New York 3, New York

Timely and Practical SUGGESTIONS

NUMBER ONE:

From time to time, your parishioners may ask what would be an appropriate gift for a newly ordained priest. Perhaps you ask yourself the same question.

What better gift, within a reasonable price range, could you suggest, entirely in keeping with the man and his life purpose than: A Subscription to *The American Ecclesiastical Review?* We shall gladly send an appropriate gift notice. Why not keep this in mind?

NUMBER TWO:

Do you bind your copies of *The American Ecclesiastical Review?* If you intend to do so, we can supply you with such copies as may be missing from your set, at the following rates:

1-10 years back	45c ea.
11-20 years back	50c ea.
21-30 years back	60c ea.
31-40 years back	70c ea.
41 years and up	80c ea.

Address: **Business Manager**
The American Ecclesiastical Review
c/o Catholic Univ. of America
620 Michigan Avenue, N. E.
Washington 17, D. C.

"MOST CONSOLING INTELLIGENCE FROM ENGLAND . . ."

It was about ten o'clock on the rainy evening of Oct. 8, 1845, when the Passionist Father, Dominic of the Mother of God, alighted from the coach at the Oxford "Angel." He was met by John Dobrée Dalgairns, whom he had received into the Catholic Church at Aston some days before, and by Ambrose St. John. Fr. Dominic, who was on his way to Belgium, had been invited by Dalgairns to stop over at Oxford; he might, Dalgairns had intimated, "find something to do there."

While the saintly Passionist missionary was descending damply from the top of the coach, Dalgairns told him the good news: John Henry Newman, that very afternoon, had finally expressed the wish to enter the Church. Fr. Dominic said simply "God be praised." They entered the waiting chaise in silence and neither spoke again until they arrived at the tiny village of Littlemore, a few miles outside Oxford.

Hardly had Fr. Dominic entered the humble quarters occupied by Newman and his friends, and settled himself by the fire to dry his clothes, when Newman came into the room, threw himself at the feet of the missionary and asked to be received into the Catholic Church. He made his general confession the same night; and on the next day, Oct. 9, Fr. Dominic heard his profession of faith and baptized him *sub conditione*. In his forty-fifth year, John Henry Newman, onetime Fellow of Oriel College and Vicar of St. Mary's, had at last found his way home to the Church of the Fathers he revered.

It is perhaps difficult for Catholics of a century later to appreciate the full impact the conversion of Newman had upon the religious world. Here was a man who had been the intellectual pride of the Establishment. His soul-searching sermons at St. Mary's had gained for him an unparalleled influence among the students of Oxford. His writings had made him celebrated as a scholar and as a master of English prose wherever the language was read. He had been, in former years, a skillful and sometimes bitter opponent of Catholicism. With Pusey and Keble, he still enjoyed the confidence and love of a host of enthusiastic followers. It is true that for three years he had been in virtual retirement,

and that his conversion was not unexpected; but the shock of it was not softened. "The thunderbolt has actually fallen upon us," wrote John Keble when he heard the news.[1] "Such a loss perhaps has not been experienced since the Reformation," was the comment of the *London Quarterly Review* in March, 1846.

The influence of Newman has expanded, not contracted, with the years, until his very real greatness has become a commonplace among Catholics. The Rev. W. J. Hegarty, C.C., writing in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for March, 1945, calls the conversion of Newman "the most important event which has taken place in the Catholic Church in England since the accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558 definitely ranked England among the Protestant states of Europe"; and he quotes Canon Barry's remark that "Newman's conversion undid, intellectually, the work of the Reformation."

In this centennial issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* several writers will pay tribute to the memory of Newman, examining his contributions to Catholic thought and spirituality from a variety of viewpoints and with the perspective of a hundred years to guide them. It might not be without interest, also, to consider the reaction of the American Catholics of a century ago, when the news of Newman's conversion first crossed the Atlantic to the United States. In the yellowing pages of the American Catholic magazines and newspapers of the years 1845-47, the record of that conversion strikes us in all its freshness. They carry the reader away from the twentieth century back to the days when Newman's conversion was not yet an old story, when its interest was contemporary and its excitement still new.

The Catholic periodicals of the middle 1840's were obviously not much occupied with "spot news." The record of events traveled slowly, particularly from Europe to America. There was to be no successful Atlantic cable for almost twenty years, and even the company organized by Samuel Morse for the erection of a telegraph line between New York, Baltimore and Washington was only a year old when Newman entered the Church. For news of Europe, the Catholic journals in the United States depended upon the British and Continental papers arriving by ship, communications

[1] *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman,* edited by Anne Mozley (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1890), II, 422.

to the editors from abroad, and the accounts of travelers. The special treasury for Catholic news of Europe and the British Isles was the London *Tablet,* as the New York *Freeman's Journal* of May 3, 1845, testifies. The Catholic magazines were much given to reprinting long extracts from each other, which made for a certain uniformity among them (excepting, on some questions, that rugged individualist, *The Boston Pilot*).

The consistent impression given by the Catholic journals of the period is one of joyous confidence in the future of Catholicism, in America and in the world. There were at the time (to take the figures quoted by the Louisville *Catholic Advocate* in the issue of Dec. 20, 1845) only 1,071,800 Catholics in the entire country, ministered to by 709 priests. But they were an army with banners. There was a reliance on the ultimate triumph of the truth that led the Catholic periodicals to quote virulent attacks on the Church by Protestant writers and lecturers, sometimes without comment, and solely, it would seem, for comic relief. Some of the charges were funny indeed.

The great increase in conversions to Catholicism, especially in England under the influence of the Tractarian movement led by the Oxford divines, was faithfully reported to American Catholics by their journals. A reader of them would have a very good idea of the progress of the Oxford Movement. The weekly newspapers, as well as the monthly magazines, carried lists of the latest converts, giving names, dates, and places. For example, *The Catholic Cabinet,* published in St. Louis with the approbation of Bishop Peter Richard Kenrick, prints in the issue of Feb. 1845 "an exact list of the members of the University of Oxford known to have turned Roman Catholics during the last three years." *The Boston Pilot* of Dec. 27, 1845, in connection with a list of recent converts, remarks that "the Sectarian papers of the United States do not record these conversions. They fear that their hood-winked readers may be led to inquire into the truths of Catholicism, from seeing so many distinguished personages 'going to Rome.'" And the *Pilot* promises grimly: "We shall keep the people apprised of these conversions."

It was not only in published lists that the great interest of the day—conversions—was stressed; it was even reflected in the fiction appearing in the monthlies. *The United States Catholic Magazine* of Baltimore, which listed as a co-editor the Very Rev. M. J.

Spalding, D.D., of Louisville, Ky., ran Mrs. Anna H. Dorsey's *The Student of Blenheim Forest, or, The Trials of a Convert*, through an unconscionable number of issues. The vicissitudes of Louis Clavering, the convert, were harrowing, to say the least. (An editorial note in the Louisville *Catholic Advocate* of Nov. 1845, remarks somewhat ambiguously: "We are glad to see the end of 'The Student of Blenheim Forest.'" The writer records the fact that "the editors of the magazine inform us that Mr. Murphy intends to present it to the public in book form," but he refrains—significantly or not, who can tell?—from adding any encouragement of his own.)

The Catholic journals did not hesitate to inform their readers of the "counter-offensive" launched by the Protestant periodicals of the day, which gave considerable space to supposed "conversions" from "Romanism" to Protestantism. In the Louisville *Catholic Advocate* for Nov. 8, 1845, there is reprinted a communication originally published in the London *Tablet*. It reads in part:

Sir—The following statement came under my notice in the last number of the *Liverpool Mercury*:—"On Sunday week, *several* converts from the Church of Rome were publicly received into the communion of the Church of England, in St. Audeon's Church, Dublin." The frequency with which similar statements have been put forward during the last few years, emanating from the same source, and having reference to the same locality, has been, to me, a subject of no small surprise. . . . That they are false, I have the strongest reasons for believing—from my knowledge of the clergyman who is manager on these occasions—from my intimate acquaintance with the locality in which St. Audeon's Church is situated—and from the advantages I possessed, during many years' residence in Dublin, of knowing much about the success of the "new lights" in their "wonderful reformation" . . . .

Nearly every Sunday witnesses the *show* of persons brought up at St. Audeon's Church to be received into the communion of the Church of England. Some of these are *professing* Catholics, who have consciences sufficiently pliable to allow them to receive money for their hypocrisy, determined to be Catholics still when the ceremony is over; but the greater number by far ARE PROTESTANTS, from the distant parishes of the city, and even from country parishes. Hundreds of these good Protestants are "*received* into the Church of England" throughout the year, and of course have no objection to be *received* as often as anything is to be had for the reception. But scarcely ever does it occur, that a single individual from the poor of St. Audeon's or St. Nicholas' parishes is seen

in these Sunday exhibitions, and thus is the farce kept up, which swells up a legion of converts in the yearly report, and opens the pockets of those Christian ladies, who rush in such eager crowds to rescue Ireland from the horrors of Popery.

For the few years before his conversion, the attention of the Catholic world (and of the Protestant, obviously) was fixed upon John Henry Newman in his retirement at Littlemore. Which way will Newman turn? was the question of the hour. Most Protestants awaited his decision with foreboding; Catholics, and many Anglicans, with hope. There were numerous prospective converts in the Episcopal communion who waited for Newman to lead the way. In *The Oxford Movement in America,* Rev. Clarence E. Walworth writes that in 1842-43 Arthur Carey and James A. McMaster, his fellow students at the Protestant Episcopal seminary in New York, already looked longingly towards the ancient faith, and were kept back only by "the example of Newman, Oakeley, and others who were their acknowledged masters."[2]

References to the probable conversion of Newman are extremely frequent in the American Catholic periodicals for the first ten months of 1845. In January, *The United States Catholic Magazine* reprinted from the *London Episcopal Record* the report that "we are now, in all probability, on the verge of a considerable secession from our venerable establishment. The fact, we believe to be that Mr. Newman would have gone over to Rome a year ago, could he have carried Dr. Pusey with him . . ." In the issue of July 10, 1845, an editorial in the Philadelphia *Catholic Herald* summed up the Protestant attitude towards the "rumored secession":

> THE TRACTARIANS.—We have nothing positive with regard to the intention of Mr. Newman and his friends. The late arrivals bring no confirmation of the rumored secessions to Rome. . . .
>
> In the meantime, the favorers and antagonists of the Tractarians estimate the rumored secession of Mr. Newman and his friends very differently. . . .
>
> The *N. Y. Churchman* says: "We shall be grieved indeed for their sakes and for our own, that we may no longer be in communion with

---

[2] Clarence E. Walworth, *The Oxford Movement in America; or, Glimpses of Life in an Anglican Seminary* (New York: The Catholic Book Exchange, 1895), p. 15.

such men. . . . But when we consider the harsh treatment they have received, the interference their liberty of thought has met with, the manner in which their best services and most generous offers have been slighted, the toleration and encouragement given to all degrees of heresy and schism while their aspirations after Catholic truth are visited on them as deadly sins, and the violence of the Evangelical party as bitter in persecuting hate as its tenets are anti-Christian, we own that we cannot feel surprised if many are driven to take a step which some at least we feel will regret. . . ."

Thus speak the friends of the Tractarians. Let us now hear what the evangelical doctors think of the matter. The *Protestant Churchman* of June 28th, gives the following:

". . . Again, the signs that the self-styled Catholic party in the Church are about to leave her, are becoming more positive and manifest. The policy of these men has doubtless been to remain in the Church so long as there was a fair prospect of effecting their objects more surely by that mode than by secession. The indications of the decadence of their influence has been pressed home upon their attention so forcibly, by recent circumstances, that it is natural to suppose many of them deem the time for separation come. Hence the rumors of their contemplated secession now prevailing, originated not by those opposed to them, but by their friends. . . ."

On July 26, *The Boston Pilot* reported: "The London Morning Herald states that Mr. Newman, the leader of the tractarian party at Oxford, is writing a book to justify his secession from the Church of England to that of Rome." (The London *Herald* was not mistaken. Newman was engaged in writing his famous *Essay on Development,* which was to be published shortly after he had entered the Church.) The Louisville *Catholic Advocate,* on Sept. 6, reproduced an article on the "progress of the Tractarians" which had appeared in the *Catholic Herald,* and which gives good indication of the manner in which Catholics awaited Newman's conversion:

If we may give entire credence to the *Protestant Churchman,* the secession of the Rev. John Henry Newman and his friends from the Church of England is *certain,* and beyond control of contingencies. A large number of his friends, some say forty; others, whose authority is deserving of much credit, say twice this number, intend to join their leader in his "retreat to Rome." The *Prot. Churchman,* who, by the way, is generally premature in sounding alarms, gives the Bishop of

Chichester as his authority. The Bishop, in a recent letter on the Tractarian difficulties, takes it for granted that the end is at hand. "It is well known that Mr. Newman is preparing for secession." This authority is considered respectable. . . .

We know not if this rumor . . . be more than one of the many premature reports of the conversion of the Tractarians. Until the announcement is made by Mr. Newman himself, we are inclined to receive such reports with distrust.

In a few days the truth of it may be known, and it be confirmed we shall look upon it as one of the victories of the church over English prejudice—a mark of the happy influence of her truth and holiness, in drawing to her bosom men of piety and intelligence. *P. Churchman* need not fear that the Catholics will raise any "shouts or loud acclaims" on the occasion, or treat the "indignant but tearful farewell" of their sorrowing friends with disrespect. We shall look upon the conversion of these distinguished divines of the English University as the work of God, and not of man; to Him be all the honor and glory, and be it our part to put aside vain and foolish boasting. . . .

The rumors continued throughout October. Finally the "Caledonia," which had sailed on Oct. 19, ten days after Newman was received into the Church, docked in Boston with the news. Newman's conversion was no longer a mere probability, it was a fact. The Philadelphia *Catholic Herald* carried the account on Nov. 6, and *The Boston Pilot* on Nov. 8. The latter paper stated on the front page: "Mr. Newman has been received into the Roman Catholic Church. Several of the members of the University were received at the same time with Mr. Newman. These announcements have caused a great sensation at Oxford. No one seems to know where, and how it will end." The news brought by the "Caledonia" took a little longer to reach Louisville, but the *Catholic Advocate* had it on Nov. 15. *The United States Catholic Magazine,* a monthly, made the announcement in the December issue: "The last month has brought us the most consoling intelligence from England, where the power of truth is daily manifesting itself in the conversion of all classes of persons to the ancient church, the 'one fold under one shepherd' . . . 'On the 9th October Father Dominick, the superior of the Passionists in England, received at Littlemore, near Oxford, after due examination, and in the usual form prescribed by the church, the renowned Rev. John Henry Newman, B.D., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and late vicar of St. Mary's . . .' "

Catholics all over the world heard the news with joy and satisfaction. The dependable London *Tablet* devoted to the event a thoughtful editorial that was picked up by the Philadelphia *Catholic Herald* (Nov. 27) and by the Louisville *Catholic Advocate* (Dec. 13). It read, in part:

> To use the current slang of the day, Mr. Newman's conversion is "a great fact." It has been prayed for; it has been written for; it has been wished; it has been dreaded. It has at length come. So far as a remote observer can presume, imperfectly at best, to judge of character, the Anglican Establishment has been deprived of the largest mind and the most penetrating intellect lately to be found, at least among her ecclesiastical children. The least part of what has occurred is that a man informed by profound genius has passed from heresy to the Church; has brought over to the camp of truth the stores of his profound learning, of his active and disciplined intelligence. . . .
>
> Over him as over all who show themselves like-minded that Church will rejoice, as the Shepherd rejoices over the lost sheep, and the mother over the child that was lost and is found. But she will not boast nor exult over him. All human capacities, great and small, are her natural tributaries. They are her inalienable property, either cheerfully placed in her keeping or wrongfully withheld. She uses them; she purifies them; she gives them a sound and wholesome direction; she patronizes them; she gives them a new value; she rewards them infinitely for the petty services they render. But she does not need them, nor does her cause depend upon them. . . .

With the exception of a column and a half of verse, the entire first page of the *Catholic Advocate* was devoted to this editorial. In the same issue that carried the *Tablet* leader, the *Catholic Herald* ran an editorial note on "Mr. Newman": "This gentleman occupies a large space in the religious world at present. We can scarcely open a paper of any creed without meeting with his name therein, and his course praised or condemned. In the plenitude of our joy at the result of his labors, we may be charged with extravagance for the several places wherein he is alluded to in our columns today. The article on the subject of his Conversion, from the *Tablet,* is a most able one . . . forming a high tribute to one who is regarded by a majority of his former clerical brethren as possessing the finest mind of the present day."

The Protestants who had looked with friendly eyes on the Trac-

tarians were saddened by Newman's conversion, and realized the magnitude of their loss . *The Boston Tablet* for Nov. 22 reported: "The Episcopalian organ of this city, the *Witness,* thus alludes to the conversion to our faith of Mr. Newman:—'A blow of equal magnitude, it must be allowed, has not befallen our Church, at least in this our day.'" In the Philadelphia *Catholic Herald* issue of Nov. 27, from which we have already quoted, there was a communication, signed "Felix," which ran as follows:

Mr. Editor:—Whilst there are some to abuse, there are others to defend this gentleman, in the course which he has thought proper to pursue. "Mr. Newman has left us," says a writer in the *Banner of the Cross,* of last Saturday week, "but I cannot sympathise with those who exult that he is gone. I suppose indeed, his withdrawl [*sic*] had become inevitable, and so it is best for all its parties that it should take place. But it fills me with sadness to think of it. We have lost one of the finest minds that the age has produced. His *piety* was a fit companion for his abilities. It belonged—(alas! that I should speak of him as if he was no more!)—it belonged to another and a better age."

To another and a better age! What age? Shall we suppose: To an age when a Bernard, an Anselm, a Thomas, were living examples of piety, learning and humility:—to an age of Catholic devotion;—to an age of Catholic benevolence and charity;—to an age when England was Catholic, and undisturbed in her faith. . . . Tell me, is it to that age—for I know of none *better* since—is it to that age that Mr. Newman's piety and mind belong? Then has he come back to all that remains of that age—to its *Church!*

Of course the Protestant and secular journals rallied as time went on, and began to ascribe reasons (not complimentary) for Newman's conversion. The Philadelphia *Catholic Herald* for May 7, 1846, reprints an article from the *Liverpool Mail* which suggests that in Newman's conversion "the Romanists will have small cause to boast of anything beyond a numerical accession to their ranks"; one of the reasons being that "Mr. Newman is of a family whose high intellectuality has, in more than one instance, shown itself in combination with strange *eccentricity.*" And Newman himself, the same article relates on the basis of "well authenticated reports" is under the influence of "visions."

Newman was under the influence, not of "visions," but of a Vision. His *Essay on Development,* which he left unfinished when he joined the Church, breaks off abruptly, and then is concluded

with the famous paragraph which begins: "Such were the thoughts concerning the 'Blessed Vision of Peace,' of one whose long-continued petition had been that the Most Merciful would not despise the work of His own Hands, nor leave him to himself;—while yet his eyes were dim, and his breast laden, and he could but employ Reason in the things of Faith . . ."[3]

The mention of the *Essay on Development* leads us to the final aspect of the American Catholic reaction to Newman's conversion. The *Essay* was published in 1845 in the United States as well as in England. And while the general impression among Catholics was very favorable, there was a sturdy dissent from Orestes Augustus Brownson, who had himself preceded Newman into the Church by less than a year.

The United States Catholic Magazine, in the issue of May, 1846, praised the *Essay on Development* in most decided terms. After commenting on the numerous conversions in England, the article continued:

> But in the foremost and greatest of these conversions the Catholic has in an especial manner reason to rejoice, and from it to anticipate an abundant harvest of good. Mr. Newman has brought with him to the Catholic Church his rare endowments, varied abilities, profound learning, and matured experience. They are from hence Catholic property, and will exert immense influence. The master-work before the reader, from his pen, is but a foretaste of what may be hereafter expected. All know with what solicitude the "Essay" was expected, and with how much avidity the volume has been received. We may judge somewhat of the sensation it has caused by the tone of the public journal and private circle. It has been since its appearance the topic of every tongue and almost of every pen. There have appeared already, or are announced, answers and replies without number, to withstand and counteract its influence. They can but avail in directing attention to the contents, and in impressing upon others the great example and precepts of its author.

In a footnote to this passage, the *Catholic Magazine* remarks that "the Puseyite organs of this country are continually pecking at the 'Essay' . . . One is forcibly reminded by them of the heroes of *Lilliput.*" The article also reminds "the men of this age of doubt or inquiry" that the conclusion that the Catholic Church is the true

[3] John Henry Cardinal Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1897), p. 445.

Church was reached "by one of the best minds of the age," after a "profound, serious, thorough, and sincere investigation of the claims of faith, as professed, taught, and practised in the most primitive ages of the Christian Church. . . ."

In the July 1846 number of *Brownson's Quarterly Review,* however, there was launched against the *Essay* probably the strongest attack it has ever faced from a Catholic critic. Orestes Brownson considered it "essentially anticatholic and Protestant," and he criticized it minutely, point by point. The writer of the review in the May *United States Catholic Magazine* came indignantly to the defense of the *Essay* (and of his own evaluation of it) in the September number of that periodical, calling Brownson's critique "essentially unjust," but expressing himself as "willing to admit the writer quite sincere in his very peculiar view." Brownson returned to the attack in the Jan. 1847 issue of his *Quarterly Review,* calling the *Essay* "one of the most insidious attacks, though not so intended by its author, on religion, which we remember ever to have read, and that is saying much." In June, 1847, there appeared a scholarly defense of Newman and refutation of Brownson in *The Dublin Review.* Orestes Brownson was not impressed with the *Dublin* article. In the Oct. 1847 *Brownson's Quarterly Review,* he maintained that some of the statements in the *Dublin* made him "thrill with horror," and he remarked that their author "betrays an ignorance of the simple conditions of Catholic faith which we should not have marvelled at in a Protestant, but which in a Catholic is as astonishing as it is deplorable."

Since we have expressed elsewhere, and at some length, our conviction of the essential orthodoxy of Newman's theory of development, and considered Brownson's criticism of it, we shall not here discuss the theological merits of the controversy over the *Essay.*[4] Almost two decades later, in his *Quarterly Review* for Oct. 1864, Brownson admitted that his reviews of 1846 and 1847 were based on a misconception of what Newman really held.

There are a great many additional quotations which might have been made from the American Catholic periodicals of 1845-47, but we believe that those given are sufficient to indicate the reaction in the United States to the news of Newman's conversion. They

[4] Cf. Benard, *A Preface to Newman's Theology* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1945), pp. 83-156; esp. pp. 97-105.

demonstrate, at least, that the high estimation in which Newman's moral and intellectual attainments are held today, a century after his conversion, is not the mere result of publicity or legend, but a simple continuation of the regard that existed during Newman's own lifetime, and before he had even properly begun that work for the true faith which has put all English-speaking Catholics so deeply in his debt.

EDMOND DARVIL BENARD
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY

Our heart yearns towards that pure Virgin, that gentle Mother, and our congratulations follow her, as she rises from Nazareth and Ephesus, through the choirs of angels, to her throne on high, so weak, yet so strong; so delicate, yet so glorious; so modest and yet so mighty. She has sketched for us her own portrait in the Magnificat. "He hath regarded the low estate of His hand-maid; for behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. He hath put down the mighty from their seat; and hath exalted the humble. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away." I recollect the strange emotion which took by surprise men and women, young and old, when, at the Coronation of our present Queen, they gazed on the figure of one so like a child, so small, so tender, so shrinking, who had been exalted to so great an inheritance and so vast a rule, who was such a contrast in her own person to the solemn pageant which centered in her. Could it be otherwise with the spectators, if they had human affection? And did not the All-wise know the human heart when He took to Himself a Mother? did He not anticipate our emotion at the sight of such an exaltation in one so simple and so lowly? If he had not meant her to exert that wonderful influence in His Church, which she has in the event exerted, I will use a bold word, He it is who has perverted us. If she is not to attract our homage, why did He make her solitary in her greatness amid His vast creation? If it be idolatry in us to let our affections respond to our faith, He would not have made her what she is, or He would not have told us that He had so made her; but, far from this, He has sent His Prophet to announce to us, "A Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and they shall call His name Emmanuel," and we have the same warrant for hailing her as God's Mother, as we have for adoring Him as God.

—Cardinal Newman, in *Difficulties of Anglicans* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1896), pp. 85 f.

IN QUEST OF NEWMAN

I remember very distinctly the first Newman thrill I received, although it is now nearly fifty years ago. In Saint John's Seminary, Brighton, Massachusetts, where I was studying for the priesthood, there was an autograph letter of Cardinal Newman. It had been written to the noted Abbé Hogan, then president of the seminary. It was but a short note, sent to the young abbé, who had come from Paris to England, offering him a bed at the Birmingham Oratory. But that little note, unimportant as it was, was treated as a relic, and guarded safely in a glass case. We seminarians gazed at it with awe; for while we were not able to appreciate fully the great Cardinal, having read only *Callista* and "Lead Kindly Light," and perhaps had a try at the *Apologia,* we knew that with our elders his very name was awe-inspiring, and we were also moved to increase our admiration for the abbé who had once seen Newman. ("And did you once see Shelley plain?")

I think that little note might have been the beginning of my interest in Newman, however unprepared I was in those days to understand him; but I can scarcely remember the time when he did not fascinate me. The fascination has not lessened with time, and through more than forty years of a busy priestly life with a considerable amount of literary work on the side, there has ever persisted the hobby of reading everything written by Newman and about him and of collecting books in that vast field. The first important set of books I procured after my ordination was a set of his works, a second-hand set and not of uniform binding or edition, but with those books on my shelves I already felt highly educated indeed. The first "Life" of Newman I ever read was one written by a curate whom I had succeeded, the Rev. Thomas McGoldrick. It was not much of a "Life," being merely an expanded lecture, but I still value it highly because it introduced me into that Newman circle by which, once one enters it, he is enthralled forever.

Such was the beginning of my Newman collection, now containing upwards of a thousand volumes, which I have given to Regis College, Weston, Massachusetts, hoping that under the guardianship of the Sisters of St. Joseph it will be a workshop for many who are attracted to the study of the great churchman, whose importance is growing with every year. Already the collection has been inval-

uable to some who otherwise must have gone to England for their research.

The collection is not complete yet. There are items impossible to obtain, as for instance that evasive pamphlet—*My Campaign in Ireland*. For that matter it is impossible at the present time to obtain a set of Newman, on account of the destruction of the plates during the present war. That will be remedied in time, of course, but still it is evident that the difficulties of making a Newman collection are much greater today than when I began to pick up such books. In spite of the *desiderata* our collection is complete enough to meet the requirements of any student of Newman, no matter how thoroughly he goes into the subject.

The ramifications of the Newman trail are endless. In one way it might take in the whole field of Victorian literature. I was thinking of that the other day as I was reading the *Pictures From Italy* of Charles Dickens. It is a mean, scurrilous book. Dickens could find little good in the Catholic Church in England as well as in Italy. He was writing that book in 1845, the year of Newman's conversion. It gives point to that conversion amidst so much bigotry. I mention it in passing only, as it is just a hint as to the broad background which it is necessary to study in the quest of Newman. Not that I have any notion of including Dickens in our Newman collection. There must be a limit somewhere, even to backgrounds. And, indeed, there is more than plenty without such side issues. I think that there is too much already. For, looking over the collection, I feel that in many ways Newman has been done to death, oftentimes by people with big names, who really have nothing to add about him. Book after book and article after article are but repetitions of what some one with authority has already said much better. Granted that in most of these cases of writing *at* Newman there was an inner compulsion from the fascination of the man, yet in all too many instances there is, on the author's part, the evident aim of seeking notice by associating his name with that of a world hero. If you do not know what to write about, there is always Newman. At any rate in the Victorian age everybody wrote about him and the Oxford Movement. Surely in those days biography was done to death. The most unimportant divine was deemed worthy of being embalmed forever in at least two volumes, often three, of "Life and Letters." And there is scarcely one of these biographies that does not contain the name of

Newman in its index, however momentary and impersonal the connection in life. It was an attempt at immortality by uniting the name of the forgotten parson or professor with that of Newman. Nowhere is that so evident as in the padded bibliographies about Newman. They are supposed to give an air of erudition, but in many cases not one idea of the books had gone into the making of that special volume. No bibliography should list a book that has not been of use to one's thesis, otherwise you might as well copy the entire card-system of the Widener Library.

Newman has been a gold-mine for anthologists, "gem" collectors, "characteristics" pointers. It has always been a marvel to me how you can get a publisher for "Selections" from this or that author. Taken from the context, such selections have little value. What good, for instance, is a passage from the "Second Spring?" You must read that sermon in its entirety, that masterpiece that drew the tears of all its hearers, or leave it alone. But still the collections of "gems" continue to be printed, for the purpose, forsooth, of teaching the student how to write like Newman. You may take for granted that most of the critics of Newman's day, while enthusing over his "perfect English" never got below the surface of his genius. They admired his style, but they ignored his argument, even questioned his sincerity. There is still too much twaddle about this style or that style. Newman was never a conscious stylist. He never wrote one line for the sake of writing. He had something he was burning to say and he said it as clearly as he could and then quit. I think that that was why he never had much use for Wordsworth, the "pontifical" Wordsworth, who never knew when he was done talking but continued to clutter up his true genius with much prosy verse.

Newman was not an easy writer. Generally he sweated blood in the process. What folly then to try to get students to imitate him! If they have something real to say and then sweat blood to say it, they may in time get to write like Newman; only they will need the blood of a Newman to do that. Perhaps these selections may do some good, perhaps they may lure the young reader to go to the original book, but somehow I rather doubt it. This, of course, does not apply to those books which have taken selections from Newman in order to make a synthesis of his theology; as, for instance, *The Mariology of Cardinal Newman,* by the Rev. F. J. Friedel, a magnificent book, a "must" book to every priest; or to

A Newman Synthesis, by Eric Przywara, S.J., now Englished from the German by Sheed and Ward (1945); or to *Newman's Apologetics,* by J. D. Folghera, O.P.; or to the most recent masterly book on Newman, *A Preface to Newman's Theology,* by Dr. Benard of the Catholic University at Washington. There are other books of the kind, like those of Juergens and Lamm, but these are very different from the "selections" made at random, apparently, just to give an idea of Newman's style.

I recall one old professor who scorned, as he called them, "books about books." He had a lot of common sense on his side. Hence, any collection of Newmaniana—not "Newmania," as some of Newman's despisers with a poor attempt at wit referred to his tremendous influence—is bound to contain a lot of dead wood. Nevertheless, it is too early yet to begin the trimming away. Newman has not come into his own yet in the entire sense, and what we may deem quite unimportant today may be of great illuminating power a century hence. Take, for instance the *Tracts for the Times.* Assuredly they are mostly dead wood today. Not one Newman student in a thousand has ever read them entirely. The student may read Tract One and Tract Ninety, since they were written by Newman, but that is as far as he cares to go. The *Tracts* were ephemeral a hundred years ago, and they have little interest now, save that they must be cherished as an important landmark; but in years to come they will be undoubtedly of great value to the historian. For that reason it is a bit early to settle what is of lasting importance in Newman. Things are still in a state of flux. The definitive Life of Newman has not been written yet, in spite of Ward's masterpiece. Innumerable letters of Newman have not yet seen the light. But if I were asked at the present time to give a short list of books that would give the ordinary reader a fine, well-rounded knowledge of Newman, I should be bold enough to suggest: the brief autobiography in *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman During His Life in the English Church,* edited by Anne Mozley; the monumental *Life,* by Wilfrid Ward; *The English Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century,* by Paul Thureau-Dangin, easily the greatest work on Newman and the Oxford Movement, which can be read either in the original French or in the English translation by William Wilberforce. These will furnish all you need to know about Newman. Of the works of Newman I should suggest: the *Apologia;* the *Grammar of Assent;*

the *Idea of a University; Discourses Addressed to Mixed Congregations; Callista; The Dream of Gerontius;* the "Second Spring," from *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions;* and the *Meditations and Devotions,* which one day may be the book by which Newman will be remembered best. Many, of course, will not agree with these selections, for everybody has his Newman favorite. But I maintain that these at least will give a broad view of Newman, and if you know them thoroughly you will know as much of Newman as does any man living. And if you do know them you will not be satisfied. You will want to go on and on and keep reading everything of Newman and about him. The deep student will not neglect a line of the great master, but for the generally cultured reader there is a great deal of Newman that can be allowed to gather dust. This may sound like heresy to some, but it is the truth nevertheless. Newman was always an "occasional" writer, as were the Fathers of the Church. He would be the last one to demand immortality for some of his ephemeral compositions.

The collection of a Newman library has been extremely interesting, though beset with many difficulties. With the one object in view, a catalogue of second-hand books is more interesting than a detective story. It is, indeed, a real detective story, running down clues for this or that Newman item, procuring the book advertised and then reading it carefully, noting every biographical reference. I think that in our collection and in the *desiderata* I have every reference to Newman ever made. In such a quest a second-hand book shop becomes a land of promise. Today you will search and find nothing. Tomorrow you will go back and discover a treasure. I shall never forget the thrill of finding in the least promising place, among many dilapidated books, the first edition of the *Lives of the English Saints,* the four volumes for one dollar. Trash to everybody else, but to me a treasure.

There are many ways of cataloguing a collection. Everybody has his own method. Not to be too meticulous, I have divided the Newman collection under seven headings: Newman's works; Lives of Newman; the Oxford Movement; books about Newman; other biographies; books for background; and autographs.

No need to give the list of Newman's works. Our collection has some two hundred and twenty-five titles, not duplicates, but of various editions. There is a peculiar fascination about a first edition. We have many. To list some of them: *Hymni Ecclesiae,*

with the Newman Preface (1838); *Verses on Various Occasions* (1868); *Discourse on the Scope and Nature of University Education,* published by James Duffy, Dublin, (1852); *The Ecclesiastical History of Abbé Fleury,* translated by Newman (1844); *Lectures on Justification* (1832); *Historical Tracts of St. Athanasius* (1843); *An Essay on the Miracles Recorded in the Ecclesiastical History of the Early Ages* (1843); the first edition of the *Apologia,* outside the pamphlet form; *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833); *Sermons Before the University of Oxford* (1843); the original pamphlets of the *Apologia,* beautifully boxed, a treasure that would give distinction to any library; the original printing of *Tract Ninety;* and Newman's *Letter to Jelf.* There are also some interesting American items, such as the first edition of the *Lyra Apostolica* (1844); *Sermons on Subjects of the Day* (1842); and the *Grammar of Assent* (1870). Patrick Donahoe of Boston issued *Verses on Various Occasions* in 1868, the same year in which the book was published in England, as also *Loss and Gain.* The house of Patrick Donahoe, long out of business, has never received due recognition for the wonderful service it did Catholic literature.

As to books about the life of Newman we have at present forty-two, demonstrating, if nothing else would, his perpetual appeal to the public. There are the biographies by Alexander Whyte, Waller and Barrow, Charles Sarolea, Rivington, John Oldcastle (the *nom-de-plume* of Wilfrid Meynell), Covelle Newcome, Robertson, Nicoll, J. Lewis May, John O'Brien (a pamphlet but a fine study), McGoldrick, Kiener, Henry Jennings, Richard Holt Hutton, Kegan Paul, Donaldson, Cunningham, Leslie Cross, Rev. William Barry, Williamson, Glenn Atkins, Smalley, Brastow, J. Eliot Ross, and Georges Grappe and Faure (both in French). The *Life* by Ward is of course the necessary biography, but the *Life* by Canon Barry and that by Hutton are still fascinating books, and perhaps more appealing to the ordinary reader. Some of the biographies are not of much value, being simply a re-hash of former books. Some, too, are aggravating in their misinterpretation. Not every writer made a hero of Newman. The *Outspoken Essays* of the gloomy Dean Inge and the essays of James Anthony Froude, who, by the way, was once an ardent worshiper of Newman, will give you some idea of the anti-Newmanites. And there is above all the ugly little book written by that strange character, Newman's brother Francis—*Contributions Chiefly to the Early History of the Late Cardinal*

Newman (1891), a book which disgraces the author but does no harm to the reputation of the great Newman. In connection with the biographies there is a very interesting booklet (1924) which contains reproductions of all the portraits of Newman.

If Newman has been done to death, more so the Oxford Movement. The story has been told over and over, not only by those who participated in it in the smallest degree, but by almost everybody else who ever read about it. As I have said, the best study is that by Thureau-Dangin, unhappily now out of print. The study by Dean Church is still a classic, and so also is the one by Mozley in his *Reminiscences,* although Newman declared that that book was in many places inaccurate. Of the later books the study by Shane Leslie (1930) is important. In addition to these, one may read the *Anglican Revival* by Canon Overton, and the *Short History of the Oxford Movement* by Ollard. The many books and essays by Wilfrid Ward, in addition to his great *Life,* such as his *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement* and *William George Ward and the Catholic Revival* will supply all that one needs to know about the movement. A "must" book for the period is Cardinal Wiseman's *The Anglican Claim of Apostolic Succession,* originally published in the *Dublin Review* (1839), the essay which practically catapulted Newman into the Catholic Church. For many of the minor characters of the Movement, Windle's *Who's Who in the Oxford Movement* gathers information that is scarcely found anywhere else. Not all these studies are in praise of Newman. He had his enemies and his traducers. Edwin A. Abbott in his *Philomythus* and also *The Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman* is bent on misrepresentation, while Walsh's *Secret History of the Oxford Movement* is a tissue of lies. But I think the meanest book ever written about Newman and Hurrell Froude is the one done by Geoffrey Faber (a nephew of Fr. Faber), *Oxford Apostles.* It aims to be sympathetic, but it has insinuations about the moral makeup of Newman and Froude that are positively vile. Geoffrey Faber outdoes Freud.

Perhaps the outstanding work in connection with the Movement is the *Remains of Hurrell Froude* (1838), the only edition. Edited by Newman and Keble, it created a sensation, aroused all kinds of bitterness and still furnishes material for the anti-Newman school. Hurrell Froude has not been done properly yet. The *Life* by Louise Imogene Guiney, although showing great research, is rather

cumbersome. I feel that she did not get at the heart of her subject. How thoroughly the field of the Movement has been covered is seen in the fact that there is even a book on *The Novel and the Oxford Movement,* a really interesting study, done by Joseph Ellis Baker.

As to books about Newman, everybody has had his say. There is no aspect that has not been considered. There is Newman, the writer, the poet, the musician, the theologian, the apologist, the preacher. Every aspect is of great interest. I remember years ago digging through all the works of Newman, studying his references to music. The notes I gathered would fill a big book. Newman loved music and used it to point many a lesson. We recall that Dean Church declared that if Newman had specialized on the violin he would have equalled Paganini. I never used the notes gathered, for I discovered that Edward Bellasis had done a fascinating book on *Cardinal Newman As a Musician.* It would be impossible to note one per cent of the books about Newman. But as a sample, Matthew Arnold, Mark Pattison, and Baring-Gould will be found worth while. And of course Maisie Ward's two volumes on *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition* are invaluable, especially in the information given about Wilfrid Ward's writing of the great *Life* and the study of the attempt of the Modernists to claim Newman as one of theirs.

Newman's rank as poet is still a subject of controversy. I think the dispute would make Newman smile. As a poet he never took himself seriously. Once when he was poking fun at Faber's interest in writing verse he declared that he himself composed his poems while he was shaving. He regarded his verses as merely occasional. He had too much serious work to do to spend himself too much on the making of verses. We remember how "The Dream of Gerontius" came near to being thrown into the waste-basket. In later years he was asked the meaning of the "angel faces" in "Lead Kindly Light." He confessed that he had quite forgotten what he had meant. It was a very personal hymn to Newman, but, strange to say, it is now such a classic because it is impersonal and can be made to embody the feelings of every individual. Essentially Newman was a true poet, but he never aspired to be a Wordsworth or a Faber. He never could be the equal of the poet Faber, for Faber's "Sir Lancelot" is in many ways superior to anything that Wordsworth ever wrote. Wordsworth himself declared that Eng-

land had lost a poet when Faber became a priest and a writer of spiritual books. I have always been a bit peeved at Newman that he never fully appreciated Faber. He told Pusey at the time of the dispute over the *Eirenicon* that he never read Faber. He might have done much worse. Faber's spiritual books will never grow stale. I prefer the judgment of the Abbé Hogan, who in his great book, *Clerical Studies,* brackets Faber with St. Francis de Sales. Principal Shairp, a great admirer of Newman personally—I always wondered why he did not become a Catholic—has many fine things to say of Newman's poetry in his *Aspects of Poetry* and his *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy.* And another fine critic, Augustine Birrell, in his *Obiter Dicta* and his *Res Judicatae* is even effusive in his praise of Newman from every angle.

To list the important books about Newman would be merely a catalogue. Especially necessary to the student are Fr. Rickaby's *Index To the Works of Cardinal Newman* and *The Nature of Belief* by Fr. D'Arcy, S.J., which treats especially of the *Grammar of Assent.* (More and more the *Grammar* is becoming of fundamental importance. It is perhaps Newman's most important book, as it is the most original. Yet we recall that Orestes Brownson could not make head or tail of it. He was a sharp critic of Newman, but there was no hard feeling between the two giants, and later on Newman invited Brownson to take a chair at the Irish University and teach Geography or any other subject he wished). As to Newman as preacher, every biography quotes the description of his tremendous influence in the pulpit of St. Mary's.

While the books about Newman are almost entirely filled with admiration, there are, too, the petty critics. Carlyle no doubt considered himself quite clever when he boorishly remarked that Newman had the brains of a rabbit; and James Russell Lowell, in his conceit, writing to Charles Eliot Norton after an interview with Newman, could only see Newman as "a wasted life." You either loved Newman or you hated him. But who reads Lowell now?

To know Newman thoroughly you must know most of his contemporaries, his friends, his enemies, his helpers, his traducers. One hesitates to put down the list of necessary biographies for fear of having it considered as a padded list. In the field of biography and reminiscences you will come across important references to Newman in the most unexpected places. Recently I picked up *A Few Memories,* by the noted actress of other days, Mary Ander-

son. She has a page in which she describes an interview with Newman which is very illuminating for a character study of the famous churchman, famous but simple as a child and a saint. How wide the field of pertinent biography is may be seen by quoting from the list at random: Brownson, McCaulay, Alfred Austin, Allies, Lord Acton, Thomas Arnold, Matthew Arnold, James Bryce, Archbishop Benson, Robert Hugh Benson, Gladstone, Bishop Butler, Dean Church, Disraeli, Lord Coleridge, Aubrey de Vere, Ambrose DeLisle, James Anthony Froude, Bishop Jewel, Mrs. Craigie, Keble, Charles Kingsley, Liddon, Laud, Principal Shairp, Maurice, Cardinal Manning, Richard Moncton Milnes, Dean Millman, Pusey, Dean Stanley, the Wilberforces, Archbishop Ullathorne, Isaac Williams, Whately, Wordsworth, Faber, Justin McCarthy, Lord Russell of Killowen, and so on. Needless to say, the most important associates of Newman to study are Gladstone, Ullathorne, Manning, and Wiseman—especially Wiseman. There were giants in those days, but of the three great Cardinals, Wiseman, Newman and Manning, there is no doubt to my mind that Wiseman was the greatest of them all, more versatile, more learned, and more of the practical churchman. He grows greater with the years. And it should never be forgotten that under God we owe Newman the Catholic to his influence and to his kindness.

When we come to the books that form the background for the study of Newman, it is hard to know just where to stop. All the works of Wiseman, of Bishop Butler, whose *Analogy* was so important to Newman, of Manning, of Faber, of Isaac Williams (Newman's curate), of Kebel, of Dalgairns, must be gone through. Keble, for example, is very important, not only for his classic *The Christian Year,* of which we have in our collection innumerable editions (a book, by the way, which the Abbé Hogan used to delight in lending to his seminarians), but also for his famous sermon on "National Apostasy," which Newman always regarded as the beginning of the Oxford Movement. A necessary book for the period is William George Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church.* You will need to consult also the many histories of the Church of England, the many books about Oxford University, the books about Döllinger, the strange works of Francis Newman, the *Greville Diary,* and the many handbooks of English literature. Even Mrs. Gaskell's novel, *Cranford,* is of interest in the study, as it refers to the National Assize and Kebel's famous sermon. Percy Fitz-

gerald's *Fifty Years of Catholic Life and Progress* is one of the most readable of books and one of the most important in the furnishing of Newman's background. Perhaps the most interesting item in this section is the number of *Brownson's Quarterly Review* (1846) which contains his criticism of Newman's *Essay on Development.* We have all the above books and more in our collection.

Autograph letters always give point to the study of a man. Our collection contains many such letters. One especially fine series is made up of four letters written at various periods in Newman's career: from Oxford, from Littlemore, from the University of Dublin, and when he was the old Cardinal. They stand as milestones in a great life, a life that becomes more important every day.

In conclusion, it may not be out of place to remind the reader once again that Regis College is only too eager to welcome the student of Newman to consult its collection.

HUGH F. BLUNT

North Cambridge, Mass.

THE VICAR OF CHRIST

If ever there was a power on earth who had an eye for the times, who has confined himself to the practicable, and has been happy in his anticipations, whose words have been facts, and whose commands prophecies, such is he in the history of ages, who sits from generation to generation in the Chair of the Apostles, as the Vicar of Christ, and the Doctor of His Church.

These are not the words of rhetoric, Gentlemen, but history. All who take part with the Apostle, are on the winning side. . . . The savage hordes come down in torrents from the north, and Peter went out to meet them, and by his very eye he sobered them, and backed them in their full career. They turned aside and flooded the whole earth, but only to be more surely civilized by him, and to be made ten times more his children even than the older populations which they had overwhelmed. Lawless kings arose, sagacious as the Roman, passionate as the Hun, yet in him they found their match, and were shattered, and he lived on. . . Has he failed in his success up to this hour? Did he, in our fathers' day, fail in his struggle with Joseph of Germany and his confederates, with Napoleon, a greater name, and his dependent kings, that, though in another kind of fight, he should fail in ours? What grey hairs are on the head of Judah, whose youth is renewed like the eagle's, whose feet are like the feet of harts, and underneath the Everlasting arms?

—Cardinal Newman, in *The Idea of a University* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1896), pp. 13 f.

NEWMAN AND MODERN EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT

When we consider the wide range of Newman's interests, and the high distinction of his achievement in so many fields it seems ungracious, as well as inaccurate, to view his work under one aspect alone, and to stress that aspect to the neglect of others. In most instances it requires considerable skill to compose such a special study without false emphasis or misleading suggestions about Newman's work as a whole. However, an exception may be made in the case of his opinions on educational problems.

He spent many years immersed in educational matters, living by turns the life of a student, a professor and finally an administrator. He was at home in a school, and completely at ease in a university. He passed his youth and early middle age at Oxford, the prime of life deep in plans for the new university in Ireland, and after these had failed, although he was elderly, he nursed hopes of a return to Oxford. During this time many letters, essays, and books came from his pen, all devoted to the educational questions of his day and of our day as well.

His thought was commonly cast in an academic mold, and his expression attuned to the prevailing fashion and tendency of intellectual discussion. His approach to nearly every question was academic—in the best sense of the word. Even in fiction or in verse Newman is didactic. He may range beyond this aim, and his motive in a given work may be more complex but he never altogether ceases to be the teacher. It is significant that his celebrated poem, "The Dream of Gerontius," which grows steadily in reputation, is fundamentally a theological treatise.

There is no need to labor the point. Newman was always the educator—he might be more, but never less. There are several methods of finding our way through the rich maze of his thought, but one at least is the silver thread of his educational writings. It is instructive to read them in their entirety and to supplement them with the letters and minor papers which Ward[1] has reprinted in the standard biography. The industrious student will soon perceive an order, a consistency which binds together these scattered works into

[1] Cf. Wilfrid Ward, *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman*. 2 vols. (London, 1912).

a logical system, and he will naturally ask what was the reception accorded to Newman's ideas when they first appeared in print, and what has been their subsequent reputation.

It is a natural question, for Newman was a great man, widely appreciated in his own lifetime, and in the half century since his death. He is a figure set in another age, and it should be possible to assess his influence today. If, as we have insisted, his educational interests were of such importance, we should expect to find, even if many of these writings now have no contemporary interest, that he has influenced in some degree the course of educational thinking since, certainly among his fellow Catholics, and possibly among others. This expectation would appear to be justified when we observe the existence of many "Newman Clubs" serving the interests of Catholic university students, and note the continuing fame of his great work, *The Idea of a University*. We are here concerned with both practical and theoretical problems in higher education, and it will be useful to deal with them in greater detail.

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR CATHOLICS

Although the Newman Club is now a well-known institution in Canada and the United States, it should not be taken for granted or casually accepted as a familiar and elementary matter. It is based upon far-reaching principles, and throws a flood of light on the practical implications of Newman's thought. An examination of them will serve to correct the popular notion that he was exclusively intellectual in his treatment of educational problems. (For the purpose of this paper the term "Newman Club" is applied only to an organization of Catholic students, guided by a chaplain, fully sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority, in connection with a state or non-denominational university, and is meant to signify the whole arrangement under which Catholic students are permitted to attend such institutions.)

These clubs are not named after Newman merely to honor a great churchman and scholar. He was in fact the inventor, and the chief advocate of the Newman Club as we know it. The story should be better known than it is.

In Newman's day the Oxford and Cambridge graduate dominated every phase of life in England. The men whom he had known when he was a student and then a tutor at Oxford were

later the bishops, the cabinet ministers, the bankers, and the eminent writers who directed public opinion to so large an extent. They were, of course, Anglican, and they constituted the great bulwark of that Church. With his conversion Newman dropped out of this powerful group and learned at first hand how different were the circumstances and the influence of Catholics. He perceived that Catholic doctrine suffered in popular prestige from the weakness and insignificance of the Catholic community itself. Catholics without a university education lacked opportunities in their careers, and Catholic champions were sometimes at a disadvantage in dispute with opponents of wider learning and education. Further, the university was in the nature of the case the usual origin of new intellectual movements. Free from Catholic influence, these would probably be infidel and heretic in character, and the eventual cause of much harm to true doctrine. It was too much to hope that the Oxford Movement would be repeated.

Newman's first solution was the traditional and approved one—the Catholic university, and he struggled for some years to establish one in Ireland, expecting that English Catholics would also attend it.[2] When this plan failed he reduced his hopes and began to consider some arrangement which would permit Catholics to attend Oxford with safeguards for their faith.[3] By this time, the religious test had been discarded at Oxford and so far as the authorities there were concerned Catholics were free to attend.

The suggestion horrified many Catholics and roused violent opposition. No effort on Newman's part could reassure them, and each of his proposals was turned aside. Oxford was then completely Anglican in atmosphere, with the great majority of the tutors still in Anglican orders. That situation was soon to pass away, and Newman knew it, but others were not convinced. On March 23, 1865, the bishops "discountenanced, to the practical effect of a prohibition" the attendance of Catholics at Oxford, and this ruling

[2] Monsignor Guilday considers that Newman's efforts at this time to secure funds and to establish the need of a Catholic university were indirectly a stimulus to Americans in their preliminary attempts to found the Catholic University of America. Cf. *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CX, 1 (Jan. 1944), 4.

[3] The story is told in detail by Ward, *op. cit.,* II, Chapters XXI, XXIV-XXVI; and from a different point of view by Butler, *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne,* 2 vols. (London, 1926), II, 1-39.

closed the issue for nearly thirty years. But this period served only to emphasize Newman's contention that the resources of the Catholics of England were inadequate to provide an institution of higher learning, and that the alternative for them was attendance at one of the established universities, or no university education at all.

In these circumstances the question was eventually reopened in 1893 after Newman's death and his plan[4] was at long last accepted in England and then approved by Rome. Catholic students were permitted to attend the universities, but a special chaplain was established at each one, with precise rules to govern him in the care of his flock. The chaplain, chosen for his own academic distinction and for his familiarity with university life, was directed to give a series of sermons and to invite other eminent clergy to preach. Needless to say, these instructions are carefully followed, and Catholic graduates of Oxford, of whom I may speak with some knowledge, recall these special sermons with particular gratitude and admiration.

This pattern was copied by Catholic authorities in the British Dominions and in the United States in settling their relations with state universities, and it has proved a success wherever similar care in the choice of a chaplain has been exercised. At the present time the arrangement represents a compromise between, on the one hand, the pressing claims of the current generation of Catholic youth who in a given locality may have no hope of the early establishment of a Catholic university, and on the other, the proper misgiving and anxiety with which Catholic authorities regard "mixed" education at a state university.

The wide adoption of Newman's famous scheme has not silenced all criticisms. The arguments advanced against it in his lifetime are sometimes repeated today. It is held that he underestimated the dangers to the faith of a Catholic in the modern university. He was himself so strong a character, dominating his environment, that he could not quite realize the plight of weaker men. It is also suggested that in his day Oxford and Cambridge were still Christian in their sentiment, but today these and other public universities are at best indifferent, and are commonly hostile, to religion.

[4] It is set forth with special clarity in a private letter written on June 8, 1872, and reprinted by Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 555.

I do not believe that these objections are valid, at least in the sense that they imply a lack of full appreciation on Newman's part. He had clearly foreseen that the scepticism of the German universities would appear in England, and run its course there as well. In spite of the plausible tribute to the unique strength of his character, in contrast to the common frailty, it is absurd to declare that Newman—a great writer on the psychology of faith, a shrewd observer of his fellow man, and the author of many searching descriptions of human weakness and imperfection—was insensitive to the reaction of the average man. The question, if argued, must be pursued on other lines. Newman weighed all the factors, was fully aware of the possible dangers, estimated as always the loss and the gain, and then decided in favor of the compromise. One may question his judgment and condemn his decision, if one is so disposed, but it is not possible to deny that he possessed a full knowledge of the issues before he made his final choice.

It should always be remembered that Newman regarded the completely Catholic institution, Louvain for example, as ideal[5] and preferred to consider anything less as provisional and tentative. He would probably have been disappointed if he could have foreseen the existence of so many Newman Clubs today, implying as they do the continuing incompleteness of the Catholic education system. Yet the whole trend of modern education indicates that this situation will not change for some time. If no more than an Arts College is required, many Catholic communities are now in a position to provide it, and fifty years ago such an institution would have been willingly accepted as a university. But today few students desire this training and large numbers demand professional courses instead. As a rule it is beyond the means of any Catholic groups, except those concentrated in the metropolitan areas of the United States, to provide such professional colleges which are very expensive and difficult to staff adequately. The state university therefore continues to improve its favored position and will attract Catholic students who, unless they are free to travel considerable distances, can find no other entry to such professions as Law, Medicine and Engineering, and this situation ensures the continuance of what we have been calling the Newman Club arrangement. Since it is a matter of policy, changing circumstances

[5] Cf. Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 50.

may lead to its eventual abandonment, but for the present this seems a remote possibility.

For our purposes in this paper it is sufficient to note that Newman is the first author and the acknowledged champion of an educational device which has won general adoption and has proven acceptable in a wide variety of circumstances. This is surely ecclesiastical statesmanship of a high order.

NEWMAN'S THEORY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The Idea of a University is a classic, often reprinted[6] and much admired. Like any classic it is a blend of the temporary and the timeless. Some passages take us back to the Dublin of ninety years ago, and to the Europe of the nineteenth century. In this setting Newman speaks for a moment as a child of his own time, and the reader, although charmed, murmurs to himself, "This was indeed long ago." But such interludes are short and are followed by magnificent pages in which all barriers of distance fall away and we cease to be conscious that almost a century has passed since Newman wrote. The nine great discourses contain much that almost startles us with deep clarity of reasoning, and clear force of logic. Men do not think and write so today, and when we recall that they were read in Newman's magic voice we recognize that the Dublin lectures must have remained the memory of a lifetime for those who were privileged to hear them.

In print, however, it seems that the series was slow to win fame. There are not many references to it by the critics of the day, some of whom do not trouble to list it among Newman's chief works, and for some time afterwards citations are very casual. Newman himself was not well pleased with the Discourses and declared that "They belong to a time, when he was tried both by sorrow and by anxiety, and by indisposition also, and required greater effort to write, and gave him less satisfaction when written, than any of his

[6] All quotations are from the standard edition, published by Longmans and frequently reissued. My copy is London, 1919. A very helpful college text has been edited by Daniel M. O'Connell, S.J. (New York, 1941), omitting certain brief passages and adding some useful material. The Discourses and one of the lectures on University Subjects have been printed in the Everyman Series, under the title: "On the Scope and Nature of University Education," with an introduction by Ward (London, 1939).

Volumes."[7] Walter Pater, however, took the view that it was "the perfect handling of a theory,"[8] and early indifference began to pass until today *The Idea of a University* is generally esteemed as the second of Newman's works, scarcely less famous than the *Apologia.* This gradual increase in reputation is largely based on evident merit, but a certain share of credit must be assigned to the English critic, Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch. He was the author of many literary studies and enjoyed a wide popularity as a lecturer. He was fashionable but he deserved to be. *On the Art of Writing,* and *On the Art of Reading* are favorites with many readers who relish the wit and smooth urbanity which does not quite conceal the vigor of his mind. In both books, which ran into many editions, he quotes Newman warmly and generously, and in the first he gives almost extravagant praise to the university lectures: "And here let me say that of all the books written in these hundred years there is perhaps none you can more profitably thumb and ponder than . . . *The Idea of a University.* . . . It has missed to be appraised at its true worth, partly no doubt by reason of the colour it derives from a religion still unpopular in England."[9] This enthusiasm aroused the curiosity of readers who might otherwise have had no interest in Newman. (Sir Arthur himself has recently revealed that his own attention was first engaged when as a freshman at Oxford he was assigned to Newman's old rooms.[10] This routine act of the college bursar deserves at least a footnote in the history of literary appreciation in England.)

Why did it require such vehement praise to bring the book into proper notice? Why was Newman himself not satisfied with it? The reasons tell us much about the subject and the times.

The first reason is one commonly overlooked even by admirers of Newman. He was a pioneer, much in advance of his time, and with the gift of accurate anticipation. He sensed the direction of events, and from the first beginnings, not yet perceived by others, he predicted the future development. From his youth he constantly foretold the wide spread of indifference to religion. Today

[7] Everyman Edition, p. xxx. (Note also the dedication, a superb example of Newman's style.)

[8] See O'Connell, *op. cit.,* p. ix f., for several other estimates.

[9] *On the Art of Writing* (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 26 f., with some omissions.

[10] *Memories and Opinions* (Cambridge, 1945), pp. 71 f.

we see the full realization of this prophecy and think that there was nothing remarkable in Newman's view. His contemporaries, however, did not accept it and were in fact somewhat irritated by it. They disliked heartily his gloomy prediction of an age of infidelity and free thought. Something of the sort happened in the case of *The Idea of a University*. Many motives, interacting, impelled Newman to compose the work. He wished to clarify his own thoughts, to instruct others, but also to oppose certain opinions on the subject which he judged to be wrong and harmful, and to be gaining strength. Until his contemporaries were brought to share his belief that these were significant tendencies deserving of immediate attention his book could not exercise its full influence. Newman delivered the university lectures between 1852 and 1858, about thirty years before English and American universities began to enter into the period of change and ferment from which they emerged in their present form. When these lectures were given only a few acute observers realized that long-established traditions were about to be roughly handled and in some cases rejected. As the universities have increasingly lost their original character to become professional schools with a narrow and immediate utilitarian purpose, those who still believe in a general education and that knowledge is an end in itself, have come to appreciate that Newman's presentation of this case is still the best available to them. Where others would fumble for words, his argument crystallizes again and again into clear gems which cannot be denied quotation:

> Knowledge is capable of being its own end. Such is the constitution of the human mind, that any kind of knowledge, if it be really such, is its own reward (p. 103).
>
> I am prepared to maintain that there is a knowledge worth possessing for what it is, and not merely for what it does . . . (p. 114).
>
> Truth of whatever kind is the proper object of the intellect; its cultivation then lies in fitting it to apprehend and contemplate truth (p. 151).
>
> We feel our minds to be growing and expanding *then,* when we not only learn, but refer what we learn to what we know already (p. 134).
>
> And therefore a truly great intellect . . . is one which takes a connected view of old and new, past and present, far and near, and which has an insight into the influence of all these one on another; without which there is no whole, and no centre. It possesses the knowledge,

not only of things, but also of their mutual and true relations; knowledge, not merely considered as acquirement, but as philosophy (p. 134).

That perfection of the Intellect . . . is the clear, calm accurate vision and comprehension of all things, as far as the finite mind can embrace them, each in its place, and with its own characteristics upon it (p. 139).

And then, should you think that his views are restricted to the intellectual aspect of man, there are many other quotations, of which the following are typical:

But a University training is the great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end; it aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed aims to popular aspiration, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise of political power, and refining the intercourse of private life (pp. 177 f).

He [a university graduate] has the repose of a mind which lives in itself, while it lives in the world, and which has resources for its happiness at home when it cannot go abroad. He has a gift which serves him in public, and supports him in retirement, without which good fortune is but vulgar, and with which failure and disappointment have a charm (p. 178).

. . . [cultivation of the intellect] is but a temporal subject, and a transitory possession; but so are other things in themselves which we make much of and pursue. The moralist will tell us that man, in all his functions, is but a flower which blossoms and fades except so far as a higher principle breathes upon him, and makes him and what he is immortal. . . . We attain to heaven by using this world well, though it is to pass away; we perfect our nature, not by undoing it, but by adding to it what is more than nature, and directing it towards aims higher than its own (p. 123).

The lectures are adorned by phrases and passages which are the delight of the anthologist, and the despair of any man who has for a moment flattered himself that he can write:

Alas! what are we doing all through life, both as a necessity and as a duty, but unlearning the world's poetry, and attaining to its prose! (pp. 331 f.)

The stimulating system [of encouraging students by rivalry] may easily be overdone, and does not answer on the long run. A blaze among the stubble, and then all is dark (p. 493).

We cannot do without a view, and we put up with an illusion, when we cannot get a truth (p. 76).

It is tempting to continue these quotations, for they redeem even the most inadequate article on Newman, but space compels us to be content with a mere reference to certain lengthy passages, in which Newman leaves behind patient logic and sweeps forward with mounting eloquence until he has achieved one of those memorable, all-embracing definitions, which illuminate the nature of man, definitions which somehow enlarge rather than restrict their subject. The most familiar is the famous description of the true gentleman (pp. 208-211), but no less worthy is his picture of the ideal university graduate, quoted in part above (pp. 177 f.), and his bold paragraphs on sinful and imperfect man (pp. 229-31).

By such qualities *The Idea of a University* has won an assured position in any list of English classics. To read it for the first time is a delight even for students who have given no previous thought to the problems of education; for those who have, it is a revelation. Why then was Newman himself dissatisfied with it?

This is not an idle question, nor can it be settled with the suggestion that Newman was influenced unduly by the ultimate failure of the Dublin scheme. In his introduction to the Everyman edition, Ward, who remains a standard authority, found an answer in the argument that the Discourses, given in 1852, are incomplete without the further lectures on University subjects delivered between 1854 and 1858. This is true enough as far as it goes, but much more is involved.

Newman had ventured into a field of inquiry where he could expect little help. He was ranging over a new and vast area, forced to make bold decisions, and he was fully aware of the fact.[11] The part of the pioneer may be exhilarating, but it also has its anxieties. Furthermore, he sought to address himself persuasively to two opposing groups, to those believers who were inclined to underestimate the value of secular and scientific learning, and to unbelievers who were scornful of theology. The necessity of keeping this double audience always in mind imposed an additional strain which doubtless affected Newman in his estimate of the work. However, I believe that there was a specific reason for his dissatis-

[11] *The Idea of a University*, p. 213.

faction—he felt a certain disappointment with the second, third, and fourth Discourses, those entitled: "Theology a Branch of Knowledge," "Bearing of Theology on Other Knowledge," and "Bearing of Other Knowledge on Theology."

I cannot prove this assertion and I therefore mention it with hesitation, but most readers will agree that the fifth, and part of the sixth Discourse, namely, "Knowledge its Own End," and "Knowledge Viewed in Relation to Learning," contain some of the most profound and finished pages in all Newman's writing. They constitute the peak of his effort in the book, and they carry the remaining chapters to a triumphant conclusion. It is my impression on the other hand that the three earlier sections on Theology, fine as they are, do not quite reach the same magnificent level. And yet they are more basic, and Newman there attempted his most important and difficult demonstrations. The distinction may be invidious, and for that matter quite invalid, but if there were even a slight difference in the level of success between the early and later parts of the book, we can be sure that Newman would sense it, and would be disturbed.[12] Of course it is impertinent and dangerous to impute one's own literary judgments to Newman himself, and he may have been quite well satisfied with these earlier Discourses, but if an unsupported opinion may be allowed, I do not think so. In this connection it is not altogether irrelevant to mention that these are the very chapters which sometimes fail to carry conviction to a modern reader.

"EDUCATION IS A HIGH WORD . . ."

We live in an age of very vigorous speculation concerning the philosophy of education.[13] For more than forty years, ever since

[12] Note the important place in the plan of the book which Ward assigns to the Discourses on Theology, *op. cit.*, I, 391 f., 390.

[13] A good general presentation is given by J. S. Brubacher, *Modern Philosophies of Education* (New York, 1939). The Catholic point of view, which was for many years inadequately represented, is now available in many excellent publications, of which two recent studies may be particularly recommended—W. F. Cunningham, *The Pivotal Problems of Education* (New York, 1940); Redden and Ryan, *A Catholic Philosophy of Education* (Milwaukee, 1943). Both books have ample bibliographies. The reader who prefers a shorter statement cannot do better than consult the pamphlet of Father W. J. McGucken, S.J., *The Philosophy of Catholic Education* (New York, 1944).

the early writings of John Dewey appeared, the American educator in particular has been most active in developing and presenting his views on the philosophy of education. Many books have been written, programs have been promulgated and supported with evangelical zeal, cliques and claques have been formed, but the results of this ferment are not impressive, and it is difficult not to be indignant and impatient with much that has been offered as the new dispensation. Tag ends of utilitarianism, confident scientism, nineteenth century "liberalism," free thought, and pragmatism have been tossed into the pot, and the resulting stew has been tricked out with catchwords such as "democracy" and "freedom," and then served up as something new and significant. Maritain has surveyed this prevailing school of thought with devastating criticism, but with his usual industry and charity has found some things of which he can speak kindly.[14] Perhaps we should do likewise, for it would be unjust to deny that in practice the modern "progressive" educator has done many good things and has sought sincerely to serve the interests of education as he understands them, but it would also be unjust not to charge him with a naïve and muddled philosophy which has brought confusion and triviality to the American educational scene.

Against this background the reader will hardly expect Newman's ideas to have played a very significant rôle, and he will be right. On visits to several university libraries I have examined the standard books on the history and on the philosophy of education, and in very few of them is Newman ever mentioned, either in the index of incidental references, or in the text where one might look for his name.[15] I am further informed by several educators whose views seem to be typical that Newman has nothing for us today, and that he represents an extreme and outmoded intellectualist position.

Some of this same spirit has even appeared among Catholic writers who in consequence ignore Newman or display a surprisingly critical attitude and maintain that he was not sufficiently prac-

[14] *Education at the Crossroads* (New Haven, 1943).

[15] Where there is a reference it is almost always the same one, to the very first lines of the preface of *The Idea of a University* in which Newman states that in his view a university is a place of *teaching* universal *knowledge*, and not of research. The usual comment on this leaves one with the painful feeling that these eminent authors have read no further and have taken no trouble to understand Newman's full and subtle opinion.

tical.[16] I suppose that we are all contaminated to some extent by the pragmatism which is native to the air of the modern world, but there is no excuse for this attitude. We must have sound theory before we can hope for good practice, and if an author, with great effort and originality, has given us such a theory, let us be thankful, and make no criticism if he leaves the details of administration to others.

But it would not be right to end the matter on this discouraging note. Newman may have had little influence with the modern policy makers in education, but as we have indicated above, the prestige of *The Idea of a University* is still great. Scholars, especially in the field of English, continue to savour it, and men of culture find therein the charter of their way of life. This gentle, reasonable tradition goes on, outshouted for the moment by the bluster of noisy technicians, but exhibiting a steady strength and a tenacity which gives a fair prospect of a new day in education.

There are many signs of that change. President Hutchins of Chicago, to summarize his views too simply, feels that there is not enough hope of agreement in theology to make it the unifying force in a university, and offers a metaphysic in its stead, but in much else he is in the closest agreement with Newman, and so are many others who have lately begun to fight so effectively for a revival of liberal education, in the old tradition, but in a modern setting. Since we are not attempting a sketch of current educational thought, we must not linger over these new and, on the whole, encouraging trends which hold great promise of a real challenge to the "progressive" educator, but it would be very surprising if most of these spirited rebels did not know and thoroughly appreciate Newman's work, and were not conscious of a great debt to him. Perhaps in certain cases this is not so, and the coincidence of views has come about without their knowledge, but this would only serve to emphasize what is Newman's chief claim on our attention. We should not read him and follow him simply because he is Newman, but because he is right.

J. F. Leddy

University of Saskatchewan,
Saskatoon, Sask., Canada.

[16] Cf. E. Leen, *What is Education?* (London, 1943), p. 18.

NEWMAN'S SPIRITUAL LEGACY TO THE CATHOLIC PRIEST

Of the many services Newman has rendered to priests, there are three that are the most precious: the example of his priestly life, his brilliant defense of the Catholic priesthood, his doctrine on the spiritual life. Each is magnificent, and has a preciousness all its own. The magnificence and preciousness grow greater as the years go by; they glow with special brilliancy during this centenary year of Newman's conversion to the Catholic Church. The first two will be touched on briefly, and the third developed more fully.

NEWMAN'S PRIESTLY LIFE

From early manhood, one might say, Newman was a priest *at heart,* even though the grace and powers of the Catholic priesthood were to come to him only in 1847. And the burning zeal of his priestly heart led him into various fields in the fight for Truth and for the salvation of souls, because his priesthood, if it was not the source, was certainly the cause of the development and use of his genius in the work of the Master whom he served so fully and untiringly. As educator, as philosopher, as theologian, as man of letters (in prose and poetry), as director of souls, as historian, as essayist, as apostle of the poor and needy, as Cardinal, he was first and foremost the priest, using his many-sided genius to bring souls to God.[1] And to this he added holiness of life, so that, as Cardinal Manning said in his sermon at the London Oratory after Newman's death, "Whether Rome canonizes him or not, he will be canonized in the thoughts of pious people of many creeds in England." This is Newman's first great service to priests, and his life should be for all a rich source of inspiration, of instruction and of guidance.

[1] Cf. my article "The Many-Sided Genius of Newman," *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* XCII, 6 (Dec. 1937), pp. 581-86. It is difficult to understand why some eminent Catholic priests should criticize Newman as not interested in the social welfare of his people. Perhaps they have never read Bishop Ullathorne's eloquent testimony as reproduced in the *Apologia* (New York and London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1905) pp. 368 ff.; or have never heard of Newman's heroic work among the poor of Birmingham and during the epidemic.

HIS DEFENSE OF THE PRIESTHOOD

The attack by Charles Kingsley, in his review of J. A. Froude's *History of England* which appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine,* was primarily an attack on the Catholic priesthood as a whole, although it was pointed specifically at Newman. The opening words are clear: "Truth for its own sake had never been a virtue with the Roman clergy. Father Newman informs us that it need not be, and on the whole ought not to be . . ." Newman understood the nature of the attack, and so did the whole world later on. It is doubtful if Newman would have written his immortal *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* if he alone had been attacked, but when the Catholic priesthood was in question, the attack could not be allowed to go unanswered, no matter what the cost. And so his defense was most noble, in every sense heroic. The triumph was glorious, complete. He was acclaimed the champion of the Catholic priesthood by his own bishop, by the clergy of the dioceses of Westminster, Birmingham, Beverley, Liverpool and Salford, Hexham, Hobart Town in Tasmania, by the members (laymen) of the Academia of Catholic Religion, and by the Congress of Wurzburg. The testimony of the latter is especially significant: "The undersigned, President of the Catholic Congress of Germany, assembled in Wurzburg, has been commissioned to express to you, Very Rev. and Dear Sir, its deep-felt gratitude for your late able defence of the Catholic Clergy, not only of England, but of the whole world, against the attacks of its enemies."[2] And this service to the Catholic priesthood endures.

HIS DOCTRINE ON THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

The brilliant example of Newman's priestly life, his glorious championing of the Catholic priesthood, are bewildering in their magnitude, and his third great service is equally so. He has bequeathed to us his precious legacy, a legacy of spiritual life. Of all spiritual writers, he has given us perhaps the most illuminating, the richest, the most comprehensive body of doctrine on the sublime truth of the Divine Indwelling. He is truly the master here. He made this doctrine the basis of a true Christian life, of Chris-

[2] These public testimonies are reproduced in the appendix of the *Apologia*, pp. 372-79.

tian manhood and nobleness, the "well-spring of the Christian's sanctity and the seed of everlasting life." He was convinced that this doctrine would rouse men to a greater appreciation of their privileges, responsibilities, and duties as Christians, that it was a doctrine at once stimulating, persuasive, and consoling. He felt that while it is necessary to insist upon the means (the sacraments and prayer) of fostering the life of God within us, yet it is equally important to fix men's minds upon the end, namely, that very life of God of which man is made a participant. He found in this great mystery the most precious effect and manifestation, the core of God's *particular* Providence towards man. He believed that the realization of this sublime truth would be man's most efficacious means of surrendering completely to God, of overcoming the various forms of deceit to which man is prone, of enabling him to become entirely sincere and simple, and of gaining, paradoxically, evangelical "childhood" and Christian "manhood."

It is remarkable that Newman while still an Anglican should have developed this illuminating and comprehensive doctrine. He was led to do so because of the peculiar problems he had to face, first, the erroneous teachings on grace and justification by two schools within the Anglican Church, the Evangelical or Protestant school, which taught that our justification is not *within* us—that grace is not an inward state but merely the imputing of Christ's merits from without, and the Latitudinarian school (including Liberals and Arminians), which taught that our justification is not from God, but is acquired through our own works (the teaching of the Pelagians); and second, what then seemed to him to be the popular teaching in the Catholic Church, namely, that too much insistence was put upon the Christian's part in his salvation, and not enough upon the doctrine of the Divine Indwelling—that this truth was not realized by the great number of the faithful, and that it had little practical influence in their lives.

However, the Divine Indwelling is but one of the several distinct modes of God's presence, all of them related and yet distinct, each having its own value and lessons. There are eight modes or forms of God's presence which are of an *abiding* nature. Two of the eight belong distinctively and solely to the Old Testament, namely, God's presence in the Pillar of the Cloud and of Fire, and His presence in the Holy of Holies, over the Ark of the Covenant. It is only to the Pillar of the Cloud that Newman refers with any

special significance, using it as the original title of his well-known hymn, "Lead, Kindly Light." But the other six modes play an important role in his teachings, and it is necessary to consider all of them in order to grasp the full value of his spiritual legacy.

(1) The presence of God in or to Himself, that is, the Most Blessed Trinity, the Father present to the Son, the Holy Ghost present to the Father and the Son, and each Divine Person present to the others. This presence is *eternal.* And it is exclusive, that is, no one can enter into the Essence of God, into that mysterious eternal infinite presence. It is true that through the Beatific Vision we shall contemplate that presence, but we cannot enter into it. Through the Divine Indwelling we are made participants of that Divine presence, we are made the temples of the Most Holy Trinity, we live with God's life. This is all mystery, but the greatest reality. This presence is that from which all the others flow. It is to be our *life* for all eternity. Newman often contemplates this holy presence, and draws from the contemplation many wholesome lessons. In his *Lectures on Justification,* in his sermons, in his poems, in his *Meditations and Devotions,* we find numerous apt and beautiful passages. Space will not allow many and long quotations, but two will be given as examples, and references to others noted.

I adore Thee, O my God, as the true and only Light! From Eternity to Eternity, before any creature was, when Thou wast alone, alone but not solitary, for Thou hast ever been Three in One, Thou wast the Infinite Light. There was none to see Thee but Thyself. The Father saw that Light in the Son, and the Son in the Father. . . . Most separate from all creatures is this Thy uncreated Brightness. Most glorious, most beautiful, Thy attributes are so many separate and resplendent colours, each as perfect in its own purity and grace as if it were the sole and highest perfection. Nothing created is more than the very shadow of Thee. . . . For me, I cannot even look upon the sun, and what is this but a base material emblem of Thee? and how could I look upon Thee and live? If I were placed in the illumination of Thy countenance, I should shrink up like the grass. O most gracious God, who shall approach Thee, being so glorious, yet how can I keep from Thee?[3]

Thou alone, my dear Lord, art the food for eternity, and Thou alone.

[3] *Meditations and Devotions* (New York and London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1893), pp. 363 f.

Thou only canst satisfy the soul of man. Eternity would be misery without Thee, even though Thou didst not inflict punishment. To see Thee, to gaze on Thee, to contemplate Thee, this alone is inexhaustible. Thou indeed art unchangeable, yet in Thee there are always more glorious depths and more varied attributes to search into; we shall ever be beginning as if we had never gazed upon Thee. In Thy Presence are torrents of delight, which whoso tastes will never let go. This is my true portion, O my Lord, here and hereafter![4]

(2) The second mode of God's presence, distinct in form from the first, is His presence in creation. All that exists outside of God exists because of His presence. In this way God is present to all beings, and in all places. And this presence is identified with God's Providence, and His *particular* Providence. All that is, all that shall be, is because it came from God and is maintained by His presence. And the traces, the remainders, the proofs of this presence are everywhere.

The Providence of God is one of Newman's favorite themes. We find it everywhere; in his poems, particularly "Lead, Kindly Light," in his sermons, especially "The Powers of Nature" and "A Particular Providence as Revealed in the Gospel," and in his *Meditations and Devotions.* The following paragraph is probably his finest and the most characteristic on this point:

God beholds thee individually, whoever thou art. He "calls thee by thy name." He sees thee, and understands thee, as He made thee. He knows what is in thee, all thy own peculiar feelings and thoughts, thy dispositions and likings, thy strength and thy weakness. He views thee in thy day of rejoicing, and thy day of sorrow. He sympathizes in thy hopes and thy temptations. He interests Himself in all thy anxieties and remembrances, all the rising and fallings of thy spirit. He has numbered the very hairs of thy head and the cubits of thy stature. He compasses thee round and bears thee in His arms; He takes thee up and sets thee down. He notes thy very countenance, whether smiling or in tears, whether healthful or sickly. He looks tenderly upon thy hands and thy feet; He hears thy voice, the beating of thy heart, and thy very breathing. Thou dost not love thyself better than He loves

---

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 328. Cf. also pp. 327, 417 f.; "The Dream of Gerontius" (*Verses on Various Occasions* [New York and London: Burns and Oates, 1883], pp. 319-70); and *Parochial and Plain Sermons* (London, Oxford and Cambridge: Rivingtons, 1868), Vol. VI, Sermon XXIV, "The Mystery of the Holy Trinity."

thee. Thou canst not shrink from pain more than He dislikes thy bearing of it; and if He puts it on thee, it is as thou wilt put it on thyself, if thou are wise, for a greater good afterwards.[5]

(3) God's presence through conscience. In this way God is present to human beings only, and only to those with the use of reason. It is a narrowing down or limitation of His presence. It is entirely distinct from the first and the second. It is a presence *within* us. It is in many respects the most intimate, the most personal, the most clearly and universally experienced of all the forms of God's presence. It is a presence that even a child can understand, and no one really denies. Those who have studied Newman know of the role which conscience plays in his teachings, the importance, the paramount importance he attaches to it, for it is the very voice of God speaking to each individually to guide him in right and wrong. It is in a particular way, as Newman clearly shows, that "inward witness" of God's presence in the soul, as well as for the truth of Christianity. The joy of a good conscience is the supreme, the only true joy that man can know in this life, and is his guide to eternal life. "How awful is the prospect of finding myself in the presence of my Judge. Yet, O Lord, I would not that Thou shouldst not know me. It is my greatest stay to know that Thou readest my heart. O give me more of that open-hearted sincerity which I have desired. Keep me ever from being afraid of Thy eye, from the inward consciousness that I am not honestly trying to please Thee."[6]

(4) God's presence in the Church. God is present in this way not to all human beings with the use of reason, but only to those who belong to the Church. It is the presence promised by Christ: "Behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world." It is the presence of God as Head of the Mystical Body.

How dearly Newman loved the Church, and grateful he was to be in her fold. How hard he worked and studied and prayed to prove that the Anglican church was part of the true Church. The Oxford Movement, the *Tracts for the Times,* especially Tract 90, had to do with that. And when he was finally received into the

[5] *Parochial and Plain Sermons,* III, 124 f. Cf. also *Meditations and Devotions,* pp. 299 ff., 420 ff.

[6] *Meditations and Devotions,* pp. 418 f. Cf. also *Parochial and Plain Sermons,* VIII, 112 f.; and *Sermons on Various Occasions* (New York and London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1900), p. 74.

Catholic Church, it was for him "like coming into port," and thereafter, in spite of the aloofness and even suspicion from which he sometimes suffered on the part of fellow-Catholics, he could not but rejoice that he had found God's abiding presence in a new way in His Church. His joy and gratitude led him to be her indomitable champion.

The title of his sermons on the Church are very meaningful: "The Spiritual Presence of Christ in the Church," "The Church a Home for the Lonely," "The Church Visible and Invisible," "The Visible Church for the Sake of the Elect," "The Communion of Saints." But his sentiments are perhaps best expressed in the following passages:

I adore Thee, O my Lord, the Third Person of the All-Blessed Trinity, that Thou hast set up in this world of sin a great light upon a hill. Thou hast founded the Church, Thou hast established and maintained it. Thou fillest it continually with Thy gifts, that men may see, and draw near, and take, and live. Thou hast in this way brought down heaven upon earth. For Thou hast set up a great company which Angels visit by that ladder which the Patriarch saw in vision. Thou hast by Thy Presence restored the communion between God above and man below. Thou hast given him that light of grace which is one with and the commencement of the light of glory. I adore and praise Thee for Thy infinite mercy towards us, O my Lord and God.[7]

I adore Thee, O Almighty Lord, the Paraclete, because Thou in Thy infinite compassion hast brought me into this Church, the work of Thy supernatural power. I had no claim on Thee for so wonderful a favour over any one else in the whole world. . . . Yet Thou, in Thy inscrutable love for me, hast chosen me and brought me into Thy fold. . . . In the course of time, slowly but infallibly did Thy grace bring me into Thy Church. Now then give me further grace, Lord, to use all this grace well, and to turn it to my salvation. Teach me, make me, to come to the fountains of mercy continually with an awakened eager mind, and with lively devotion. Give me a love of Thy Sacraments and Ordinances. Teach me to value as I ought, to prize as the inestimable pearl, that pardon which again and again Thou givest me, and the great and heavenly gift of the Presence of Him whose Spirit Thou art, upon the Altar. Without Thee I can do nothing, and *Thou art where Thy Church is and Thy Sacraments.* Give me grace to rest in them for ever, till

[7] *Meditations and Devotions,* pp. 398 f.

they are lost in the glory of Thy manifestation in the world to come.[8]

(5) God's presence in the Holy Eucharist. This distinctive presence is more limited than that of God's presence in the Church, for only at Mass or where the Sacred Species are reserved is God present in this marvellous way. It is a presence that is localized, and is dependent upon the accidents, the physical qualities of the Sacred Species. It is the unbloody renewal and commemoration of the Sacrifice of Calvary through which the Divine Life was restored to the human race, and it is the Food through which that Life is nourished. It is a sacrament, a sacrament of the *living*.

How beautiful and great was Newman's love and awe for Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. This is manifest in his remarkable Anglican Sermons such as "The Daily Service," "The Eucharistic Presence," "Attendance on Holy Communion," and "The Gospel Feast." It finds a truer and richer expression in his Catholic writings. Read that magnificent page in the sermon "Omnipotence in Bonds," or this paragraph, taken from the immortal "The Second Spring": "You, who day by day offer up the Immaculate Lamb of God, you who hold in your hands the Incarnate Word under the visible tokens which He has ordained, you who again and again drain the chalice of the Great Victim; who is to make you fear? what is to startle you? what to seduce you? who is to stop you, whether you are to suffer or to do, whether to lay the foundations of the Church in tears, or to put the crown upon the work in jubilation?"[9]

(6) God's presence in the soul, through the Divine Indwelling. God is present in this way in only those souls who are in the state of grace. This is a mystery as great as that of the Holy Eucharist, but the words of Christ, "If anyone love me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our abode with him" are as unequivocal as "This is My Body," "This is My Blood." As a lover yearns to be in the company of the beloved as continually or as often as possible, so God remains with His beloved creatures not only under the same roof or in a nearby church, but in the very soul of each and every one

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 399 f. (italics mine). Cf. also the "Prayer for a Happy Death" (*ibid.*, p. 290).

[9] *Sermons on Various Occasions*, p. 181. Cf. also the beautiful prayer in *Meditations and Devotions*, p. 352.

who loves Him. The Blessed Sacrament is a *means* of nourishing the Divine Life within in the soul, and the possession of that Divine Life is the *end* of man's creation, the cause and the center, after God's glory, of the whole economy of the creation and redemption. Our Lord said: "I have come that they may have life, and have it more abundantly." Even those who cannot receive Holy Communion can still possess this Divine Life in their souls.

Moreover, without this Divine Life in the soul, a man cannot receive the Holy Eucharist worthily and with benefit, and he may even flee from or avoid the Presence of God in this Holy Sacrament; he becomes a dead member of the Church, his conscience upbraids him, so that he may try to still it, or kill it, or like Adam, would hide away from God; the thought of God's presence in creation brings him no comfort or delight, and may even lead him to deny that there is a God; and without that Divine presence in his soul in this world, no man can enjoy the ineffable presence of the Most Holy Trinity for all eternity.

Some Catholics, when speaking of the state of grace, speak of it as something negative, namely, as not having mortal sin on the soul; they do not speak, they do not think, they do not know (in many cases) of that sublime *positive* aspect of God's grace, the Divine Indwelling. Men will tip their hats when passing in front of a church, or will drop in for a visit, genuflect before the Blessed Sacrament, keep a reverential silence and attitude there, but they do not think of making visits to God dwelling in their own souls, really and truly, whom they can visit at any time, in any place, under all circumstances. And how seldom do priests think of this, or teach it to their people—priests, who are called "Father" by the faithful because they "beget" souls to this spiritual life and nourish that life through the sacraments.

CONCLUSION

This then is Newman's third great service to priests, to remind them of the sublime truth of the Divine Indwelling, and by his masterful teachings on it to help them in their own meditations, and in giving it to others. Space allows for only the following brief outline of the main features of his teaching.[10]

[10] For a more complete treatment of the subject cf. Lamm, S.M., *The Spiritual Legacy of Newman* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1934.)

I. Newman's profound awe at the contemplation of this mystery, and his deep gratitude for it. The following passages best expressed this:

My God, I adore Thee, O Eternal Paraclete, the light and life of my soul. Thou mightest have been content with merely giving me good suggestions, inspiring grace and helping from without. Thou mightest thus have led me on, cleansing me with Thy inward virtue, when I changed my state from this world to the next. But in Thine infinite compassion Thou hast from the first entered into my soul, and taken possession of it. Thou hast made it Thy Temple. Thou dwellest in me by Thy grace in an ineffable way, uniting me to Thyself and the whole company of angels and saints. Nay—Thou hadst taken possession of my very body, this earthly, fleshly, wretched tabernacle—even my body is Thy Temple. O astonishing, awful truth! I believe it, I know it, O my God![11]

What a thought is this, a thought almost too great for our faith! Scarce can we refrain from acting Sarah's part, when we bring it before us, so as to "laugh" from amazement and perplexity. What is man, what are we, what am I, that the Son of God should be so mindful of me? What am I, that He should have raised me from almost a devil's nature to that of an Angel's? that He should have changed my soul's original constitution, new-made me, who from my youth up have been a transgressor, and should Himself dwell personally in this heart of mine, making me His Temple? What am I, that God the Holy Ghost, should enter into me and draw up my thoughts heavenward "with plaints unutterable?"[12]

II. The points of doctrine which Newman stressed:

A. Our righteousness is:

1. Inward, that is, it is actually in man; it is not without an "inward change"; it does not dispense with personal effort.
2. A gift.

B. Our righteousness is the very indwelling of the Holy Trinity. The Divine presence and grace, though distinct, cannot be separated in the soul, and it is a mistake to separate them in our thoughts.

[11] *Meditations and Devotions,* p. 401.

[12] *Parochial and Plain Sermons,* III, 125 f.

III. The office and manifestations of the Divine Indwelling:
   A. The completion in the soul of the work of Christ the Saviour.
      1. The work of purification.
      2. The implanting of good will.
      3. The impressing of the Divine image on the soul.
   B. The Divine presence manifests itself by continual prayer.
      1. It fixes the mind on God.
      2. It raises the mind to Christ.
      3. It bestows peace.
      4. It creates and fosters sympathy for others.
      5. It leads to sincerity and simplicity.

IV. Newman's special views of the Divine Indwelling:
   A. It is the most precious effect and manifestation, the centre and heart of "particular Providence."
   B. The "realizing" of the Divine Indwelling is the surest means of overcoming or counteracting "hypocrisy" (the manifold deceit to which man is prone), and of "surrendering" completely and unconditionally to God through sincerity and simplicity.

Let us conclude this article with a Newman prayer that is especially meaningful for priests:

"Stay with me, and then I shall begin to shine as Thou shinest; so to shine as to be a light to others. The light, O Jesus, will be all from Thee. None of it will be mine. No merit to me. It will be Thou who shinest through me upon others. O let me thus praise Thee, in the way which Thou dost love best, by shining on all those around me. Give light to them as well as to me; light them with me, through me. Teach me to show forth Thy praise, Thy truth, Thy will. Make me preach Thee without preaching—not by words, but by my example and by the catching force, the sympathetic influence, of what I do—by my visible resemblance to Thy saints, and the evident fullness of the love which my heart bears to Thee."[13]

WILLIAM R. LAMM, S.M.

St. Mary's University,
San Antonio, Texas.

[13] *Meditations and Devotions*, p. 365.

"THE SALVATION OF THE HEARER . . ."

For the conscientious priest the problem of sermon work is a perennial source of unrest. Not only does it crop up week after week, but it is as many-sided as it is constant. There are, for example, the basic practical difficulties that attend most parochial preaching. Some of these time largely solves, others, however, it only intensifies. Among these pragmatic difficulties perhaps the most tangible is the matter of parochial cares. These dash themselves against the priest's waking hours and leave him only broken shards of time in which to seek that "quiet and repose of the humors" during which, St. Albert the Great tells us, "the mind becomes prudent and wise." Closely related to this ever present problem is the constantly widening distance between the priest and his studies, a gap that the requirements of pastoral work bring about. Add to this the fact that all too often the priest is bitterly aware of how little real training in speaking technique entered into his seminary course, and the sum total is a consciousness of defects that further affects his preaching and his attitude towards it.

Now, while admitting that these are real and everyday problems, they should not be allowed to obscure what is the most fundamental problem for the conscientious preacher. For without at all detracting from their reality, nor in any sense desiring to appear condescendingly facile, still we note that these practical problems are external to the question of preaching itself and in the long run their solution lies in control and discipline. In saying this, though, it would be folly not to recognize that the acquisition of such control and discipline is an arduous and exacting task and requires long range patience with oneself. Yet even granting this good will and this control of the situation, they at best only serve to remove the obstacles to good preaching; they do not, of themselves, suffice to produce it. And behind this conclusion is the fact that these things do not directly touch upon the fundamental problem that is inherent in the object of the Catholic sermon — the conveyance of Catholic truth to the mind of the hearer.

It must be borne in mind, however, that this last statement is not without its necessary limitations. First, Catholic truth contains, in the words of the Vatican Council, "mysteries which so exceed the created intellect that even when they are revealed to

us they are covered by the veil of faith and remain so while we walk in this life."[1] And no sermon is expected to convey what revelation itself has not conveyed. At the same time it is quite clear that a full understanding of Catholic theological teaching requires a technical background that not too many Catholics possess. After all, as has been rather pointedly remarked, all men are called to salvation but not all men are called to be metaphysicians. It is therefore in the field that lies between these two limits that the fundamental sermon problem abides. It concerns itself with the relation between Catholic truth as it has been given to the priest and as the years have enriched it in his mind, and his ability to place it in the mind of his hearer as a real and moving thing. It is by way of presenting one possible solution that this article on Cardinal Newman's sermons is written.

The first thing that Cardinal Newman's sermon work has to offer, at least for the present writer, is that he is primarily a preacher, rather than a pulpit orator in the classical tradition of oratory. For, while no one denies the importance and the eminent place of a Bossuet or a Massillon, still the classical pulpit oratory is limited both by the occasions which call for it and the talent that it requires, if it is to be at all effective. Preaching, on the other hand, is a tool that admits of constant and almost universal employment, nor does it necessarily demand the wide range of talent that is essential to good pulpit oratory. The pulpit orator, at least in the classical tradition, works on a large canvas; Catholic truth is presented in stately cadence and martial array; the orator himself thinks in terms of vistas and perspectives and calls on the massed display of Catholic thought and history. In contradistinction to this, the preacher is content to etch out a single point or aspect of Catholic truth, and so develop it that he may set it firmly and efficaciously in the mind of his hearer. Finally, though both the orator and the preacher seek to move their hearers, the former would move the group to a fuller appreciation of the magnificence or order or beauty of Catholicism; or, perhaps, the immensity of the burden of sin, or its untold horrors. The preacher is concerned with moving the individuals present to take this one step towards the total perfection demanded of the Christian. The difference might be summed up thus: the immediate concern of the

[1] *DB*, 1796.

preacher is the individual, whereas the immediate aim of the orator is the group and the occasion. Yet, in all this, it is to be noted that in the actual sermon the preacher will often achieve genuine oratorical levels, and the orator will not be without power to move the individual. The abstract distinctions made here rest solely on immediate aims and basic methods.

How, then, do the sermons of Cardinal Newman exemplify the primary end of the preacher? The answer is implicit in the preceding paragraph. His whole thought is colored and dominated by his concern for the individual. This is apparent in both the selection of subject and in the manner in which it is presented and developed. By way of illustration one might take almost any sermon of his, analyze it, and see how manifest is his abiding concern with the individual. Indicative of such an approach are the sermon titles themselves. Thus: "The Difficulty of Realizing Sacred Privileges,"[2] "Secret Faults,"[3] "Promising Without Doing,"[4] "Contracted Views in Religion,"[5] all evidence the direct approach and the restriction of subject matter. The same concern might be illustrated from the structure of the sermons but that will be treated more fully in another connection. Here, however, the point is rather to show how important a place this concern for the individual held in Cardinal Newman's own mind, a point upon which the sermons offer considerable self-revelation.

For the writer, the sermon that offers the most convincing witness to the great Oratorian's understanding and concern for the individual is "The Individuality of the Soul,"[6] because what is said in this sermon could only be the flowering of a great deal of personal thought and meditation. His very statement of the problem evinces this.

> Nothing is more difficult than to realize that every man has a distinct soul, that every one of the millions who live or have lived is as whole and independent a being as if there were no one else in the whole world but he.[7]

Again and again in the course of the sermon he describes how easy it is to forget this fact. Typical of this emphasis is the passage:

[2] *Parochial and Plain Sermons* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902), VI, 94.

[3] *Ibid.*, I, 41.

[4] *Ibid.*, I, 165.

[5] *Ibid.*, III, 102.

[6] *Ibid.*, IV, 80.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 80 f.

Or again survey some populous town: crowds are pouring through the streets; some on foot, some in carriages; while the shops are full, and the houses too could we see them. Every part of it is full of life. Hence we gain a general idea of splendour, magnificence, opulence and energy. But what is the truth? why that every being in that great concourse is his own centre, and that all things about him are but shades, but a "vain shadow" in which "he walketh and disquieteth himself in vain." He has his own hopes and fears, desires, judgments, and aims; he is everything to himself, and no one else is really anything. No one outside himself can really touch him, can touch his soul, his immortality; he must live with himself for ever. He has a depth within him that is unfathomable, an infinite abyss of existence; and the scene in which he bears part for the moment is but like a gleam upon its surface.[8]

This awareness of the uniqueness of the individual is further specified when it is shown how far-reaching this conception is, having its place in even the most casual contacts.

We may recollect when children, perhaps, once seeing a certain person; and it is almost like a dream to us now that we did. It seems like an accident which goes and is all over, like some creature of the moment, which has no existence beyond it. . . . But if we have once seen any child of Adam, we have seen an immortal soul. It has not passed away as a breeze or sunshine, but it lives at this moment in one of those places whether of bliss or of misery, in which all souls are reserved to the end.[9]

Any number of passages similar to those just quoted might be adduced. One might instance his moving description of Christ's concern for the individual in "A Particular Providence Revealed in the Gospel";[10] or in the same sermon the scripturally rich section that paints God's care for each of us.[11] Since, however, the quotations are only by way of indicating the color of Cardinal Newman's mind in the matter of preaching, the purpose will be better served and complemented by setting down his own analysis of the reasons for such concern on the part of the preacher.

If we are sure that the most Holy Redeemer has shed his blood for all men, is it not a very plain and simple consequence that we, His

---

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 82 f. [9] *Ibid.*, pp. 85 f. [10] *Ibid.*, III, 120 ff.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 125. Another sermon along this same line is "The Immortality of the Soul," *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, I, 15.

servants, His brethren, His priests should be unwilling to see that blood shed in vain—wasted I might say as regards you, and should wish to make you partakers of the benefits which have been vouchsafed to ourselves? . . . What is so powerful an incentive to preaching, as the sure belief that it is the preaching of the truth? What so constrains to the conversion of souls, as the consciousness that they are at present in guilt and peril? What so great a persuasive to bring men into the Church as the conviction that it is the special means by which God effects the salvation of those whom the world trains in sin and unbelief? . . . We come among you, because we believe there is but one way of salvation marked out from the beginning and that you are not walking along it; we come among you as the ministers of the extraordinary grace of God which you need; we come among you . . . because we dare not hide in a napkin those mercies and that grace of God which have been given us, not for our own sake only, but for the benefit of others.[12]

If the passage just quoted be taken in conjunction with the preceding ones, there is given to us not only an insight into the mind of Newman the preacher, but there is also offered a basic description of any true preacher's mind. In fact, a preacher who imbibes of such thoughts and whose work is called into being by such convictions cannot help but be aware that he is directing his efforts to distinct, unique, and infinitely important individuals and not to some faceless group. Likewise, as the preacher becomes increasingly aware of the importance to God of each of his hearers and, at the same time, is growingly conscious of the supreme necessity of his saving message, then he will also be mindful that his sermons are not casual affairs but matters of weighty obligation. Nor does it seem too far-fetched to think that the personal realization of these basic facts lays the foundation for a vital contact between the preacher and his hearers. Certainly, a living concern for those whom he addresses and an abiding awareness of the necessity of the truth that he carries will release the well-springs of his own convictions. This, in turn, will cause them to flow towards his hearers, and it is this vital reaching out that will be the bridge over which Catholic truth will best pass.

But while these things are fundamental and of the essence of

[12] "The Salvation of the Hearer the Motive of the Preacher," *Discourses Addressed to Mixed Congregations* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902), pp. 17 f.

good preaching they do not, of themselves, dispense with good technique. It is true, of course, that such convictions are the informing soul of technique, and that without them even the best technique degenerates into conscious or unconscious charlatanry. None the less, good technique can give to these convictions a fullness and an effectiveness that the preacher cannot otherwise supply save perhaps through a *gratia gratis data*—a gratuitious gift which, to say the least, it would be presumptuous of the preacher to depend on every time he delivers a sermon. Consequently, it will be of real value to view some elements of Cardinal Newman's own sermon technique. For, if his fundamental cast of mind and his technique be recognized as forming a living whole, then, perhaps, the careful reading of his sermons may be of assistance in formulating effective sermons of one's own.

The first element of technique presented here is one that would seem to be the Cardinal's most characteristic and effective method. It is one that not only abounds in his sermons, but is employed extensively in his controversial writings and gives to them much of their power. This element of his technique may be described as: *the analysis and formulation for his hearers of their own personal reactions and behavior when they come into contact with religious realities.* Sometimes this particular technique is the very structure of the sermon.[13] In any case, it occurs in all of his sermons either explicitly or implicitly. Its effectiveness arises from the fact that it crystallizes the question, or problem, or truth in such a personal way that the answer itself has an immediate and personal significance.

Since it is an almost impossible task to make universally satisfying selections from the countless examples at hand, the illustrations given are chosen because of their personal appeal. So on the question of duty:

> To find fault with the circumstances in which we find ourselves is our ready and familiar excuse when our conduct is arraigned in any particular . . . In truth, nothing is more easy to the imagination than duty in the abstract, that is, duty in name and not reality. It is when it assumes a definite and actual shape, when it comes upon us under circum-

[13] Cf. "Human Responsibility, As Independent of Circumstances," *Sermons Preached Before the University of Oxford* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902), p. 136.

stances (and it is obvious it can come no other way), then it is difficult and troublesome. Circumstances are the very trial of obedience. Yet, plain as this is, it is very common to fancy our peculiar condition particularly hard, and that we should be better and happier men in any other.[14]

This approach lays its finger upon a common form of self-deception, but it does it so impersonally that even the reader feels as though he were examining his own conscience, and finds himself furnishing his own illustrations.

An even more powerful use of this technique is seen in the analysis of the growth of an irreligious cast of mind in a young man.

He has aspirations and ambitions which home does not satisfy. He wants more than home can give . . . he listens to views and discussions which are inconsistent with sanctity and religious faith. At first he has no temptation to adopt them; he only wishes to know what is "said." As time goes on, however, living with companions who have no fixed principle, and who, if they do not oppose at least do not take for granted, any of the most elementary truths; or worse, hearing or reading what is directly against religion, at length without being conscious of it, he admits a sceptical influence on his mind. He does not know it, he does not recognize it but there it is; and *before* he recognizes it, it leads him to a fretful, impatient way of speaking of the persons, conduct, words and measures of religious men. . . . And so he goes on, approximating more and more closely to sceptics and infidels and feeling more and more congeniality with their modes of thinking, till some day suddenly, from some accident, the fact breaks upon him, and he sees clearly that he is an unbeliever himself.[15]

Here each step in the road to unbelief has been laid bare. At any step the individual who has begun this journey can see how far he has travelled and where he now tarries. To all appearances neither praise nor blame has been laid, but the blindness and folly of the individual is patent in every descriptive touch.

An example of the same approach used positively may be seen in his sermon, "Waiting for Christ."

. . . do you not know what it is to so love and live upon a person who is present to you, that your eyes follow his, that you read his soul, that

---

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 140 f.

[15] "Intellect, the Instrument of Religious Training," *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902), pp. 10 f.

you see its changes in his countenance, that you anticipate his wants, that you are sad in his sadness, troubled when he is vexed, restless when you cannot understand him, relieved, comforted when you have cleared up the mystery?

This is the state of mind, when our Lord and Saviour is its Object, not intelligible at first sight to the world, not easy to nature, yet of so ordinary fulfillment in the Church in all ages, as to become the sign of the Presence of Him who is unseen, and to be a sort of note of the divinity of our religion.[16]

These three illustrations of this technique (to which any reader of Cardinal Newman will be able to add a hundred) exemplify a number of points that can help in the building of effective sermons. First and foremost, through its skillful use one can actually bring truth into living contact with the individual. Almost unknown to himself the hearer's mind can be made to face itself in the light of such an analysis. More than this, it is not the preacher but the hearer who sits in judgment upon himself, measuring his acts in the light of Catholic truth and principle. By such a method, too, there is made possible some release from a complete dependence on stories and badly crippled similes. Instead of dragging in stories by the most tenuous of connections, the hearer himself furnishes the best of all illustrations, his own actions and reactions. He can be led to apply this truth or this norm to himself and see his own needs and shortcomings. Clothed with apparent impersonality this technique can be developed to the point where it becomes the articulate voice of conscience calling to the will to act upon what it now sees.

Yet, while admiring Cardinal Newman's skillful and flexible use of this technique, it should not be thought that it is outside the competence of the ordinary priest. No one, of course, will deny Newman's mastery, or say that he can use it in exactly the same way. A priest, however, does deal with a variety and number of individuals in their most intimate and revealing moments. After a few years of pastoral work, he can have in his grasp a working knowledge of human nature in act. He has certainly come to some realization of the complexities of motivation and rationalization that enter in human acts and living. And the reactions of types

[16] "Waiting for Christ," *ibid.*, p. 36. Here might be added his description and analysis of the sinner turning from sin in "Saintliness Not Forfeited by the Penitent," *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902), p. 18.

and ages and varying cultural levels to Catholic truth and principles are for him a fairly familiar land, since so much of his work is done there. He has therefore a rich mine out of which he may draw the material for this technique.

Nor is this source of the raw material confined to his observation of others. He himself is just as rich with this ore. Almost from the time he has been capable of grasping abstract ideas, he has been in constant contact with Catholic realities and truths. Through the weighing of individual acts in the light of clear-cut and objective moral principles, he has achieved a greater degree of objectivity than he is liable to be aware of. At the same time, retreats, spiritual reading, meditations, and examinations of conscience extended over the years have put into his hands a real capacity for objective introspection, more perhaps than he realizes. All these are at his service here, because as a human being his fundamental responses to high aspirations are not alien to human life. Bound, as he is, to all men by the cords of Adam, his own life mirrors the basic elements of reaction and behavior in the face of religious truth; it reflects the difficulties of depending on faith and not sight; and it images the corrosion that daily duty and routine spiritual activity can produce. With such self-knowledge at his call, plus his own experience as a priest, the preacher carries within him not only the material out of which this form of sermon technique is molded, but at the very least a basic power so to mold it.

The full power of this technique, though, calls for another element which goes hand in hand with it: the use of words. And in such usage Cardinal Newman has much to offer his reader. Almost without exception the words used in his sermons are simple and easily apprehended. Their force lies in the color which they give to his thought. Variety and fluency is introduced by a series of adjectives, adverbs or phrases. Each one of these adds a note to the idea or reveals another of its facets. When they are taken together they give to the idea a color and a vividness that catches the mental eye of the listener because they convey that idea pictorially. In instance of this, take his picture of the young Augustine:

> With his young ambition and his intellectual energy, and his turbulent appetites; educated yet untaught; with powers strengthened, sharpened, refined by exercise, unenlightened and untrained,—[he] goes forth into

the world ardent, self-willed, reckless, headstrong, inexperienced . . . , to become the victim of heresy and sin.[17]

With an economy of stroke a complete picture of the young Augustine is set before our eyes. Using only adjectives and adjectival phrases the whole history is limned out: *"With his young ambition and his intellectual energy, and his turbulent appetites."* The combination lends to the idea a rich pictorial color. Similarly in the striking etching of Augustine's early career: *"[he] goes forth . . . into the world ardent, self-willed, reckless, headstrong, inexperienced."* Each word gives voice to a whole history and combined they form a vivid cross-section of that history.

The use of this method to bring out contrasting realities is equally effective, as in his delineation of Christ's gift of peace.

It was a peace but a new peace, "not as the world giveth;" not the exultation of the young, light-hearted and simple, easily created, easily lost: but a serious, sober, lasting comfort, full of reverence, deep in contemplation.[18]

Here the purpose is to show what Christian peace really is, and its difference from the peace of the world. It might be done by a story. It could be served by presenting the abstract notions that are implied. Instead, by a rich flow of words, each of which conveys these abstractions in a vivid and concrete way, the full idea is driven into the mind. The contrast emphasizes the whole thing: "serious" is opposed to "exultation," "sober" to "light-hearted," "lasting comfort" to "easily created, easily lost," and then "full of reverence, deep in contemplation."

One somewhat more lengthy passage will conclude these examples. This passage is a particularly felicitous combination of the two elements that have been noted in this article: the analysis of human behavior and the use of words.

. . . when a man feels himself possessed of good abilities; of quickness in entering into a subject, or of powers of argument to discourse readily upon it, or of acuteness to detect fallacies in dispute with little effort, or of a delicate and cultivated taste, so as to separate with precision the correct and beautiful in thought and feeling from the faulty and

---

[17] "Intellect the Instrument of Religious Training," *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions,* pp. 4 f.

[18] "Christian Nobleness," *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day,* p. 141.

irregular, how shall such a one be tempted to self-complacency and self-approbation! How apt will he be to rely upon himself, to rest contented with himself; to be harsh and impetuous; or supercilious; or to be fastidious, indolent, unpractical; and to despise the pure, self-denying temper of religion, as something irrational, dull, enthusiastic, or needlessly rigorous![19]

A careful perusal of the ideas contained here and a consideration of the number and variety of terms chosen to make those ideas live will indicate the depths that go into this proper use of words. There is presented a careful analysis of the type of man described and a clearly and sharply drawn set of pictures. The whole process is the result of a judicious selection and accumulation of words that complement and enrich one another. By way of tasting the full flavor of this method, one might read aloud the words "fastidious, indolent, unpractical" and "irrational, dull, enthusiastic or needlessly rigorous." If they are read with an effort to express what they contain, it will be found that their idea content depicts the reality intended and the very sound co-operates in conveying the same thing.

Many other elements of the great convert's sermon work might be treated. Mention might be made of his use of Scripture and scriptural language; his use of the Fathers and of patristic ideas; his sense of the history of Catholicism and his personal awareness of the place and beauty of the Church of Christ. Limitations of space prevent taking these up here. What has been seen, though, might be termed the fundamental elements of his sermon technique and work. The purpose in treating them at all was to lay down general lines for the formulation of effective sermons. Hence, if thought is evoked in this field the article has accomplished its aim.

Lest, however, all this seem too remote a presentation, attention should be called to the presupposition that underlies the effective use of the methods described and analyzed. For the development which such technique assumes presupposes work. Sermon technique is an art and as an art it demands consistent and careful practice. A dozen trys will not enable the tyro to translate the music sheets into music of Chopin, neither does the ability to recognize the notes of the scale make a singer, or a good sense of color make a painter. Consistent practice in correct methods, experiment,

[19] "Temporal Advantages," *Plain and Parochial Sermons*, VII, 65.

and failure are the tools which develop the art. The mere use of Newman's words will not transform the preacher into another Newman. He is a master of English prose and much of his mastery lies in this very selection of words. But a wide and flexible command of words is not an impossible task for the priest, any more than the ability to analyze human behavior is outside his scope. Reading, speaking, and writing can each contribute to this. It is not impossible to read one sermon of his a week with these ideas in mind and then try to translate some of it into one's own efforts. This very habit could be a beginning if it were accompanied by an occasional careful writing of a sermon. Still all this is the dull and unrewarding work of practice, and ultimately the willingness to submit oneself to the task of practice stems from the personal conviction that it is a matter of personal obligation. And a real and personal sense of obligation has its source in the full understanding of what it means to be a priest, the minister of Christ the Divine Teacher, the coadjutor of God the Revealer.

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

BEAUTY AND SENSUALITY

If beautifulness is all that is needed to make a thing right, then nothing graceful and pleasant can be wrong; and, since there is no abstract idea but admits of being embellished and dressed up, and made pleasant and graceful, it follows as a matter of course that anything whatsoever is permissible. One sees at once, that, taking men as they are, the love of the beautiful will be nothing short of the love of the sensual.

—Cardinal Newman, in *Historical Sketches* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902), III, 84.

MISSION INTENTION

"Christian Kindness to Converts from Mohammedanism" is the Mission Intention for the month of October, 1945.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN AND THE VATICAN DEFINITION OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

John Henry Newman's teaching on the Vatican Council definition of papal infallibility stands apart from all his other contributions to Catholic thought. The great English churchman made valuable additions to the Catholic literature on the history of dogma, on the spiritual life (particularly in the field of priestly perfection), and on the philosophy of education. His works on the genesis of faith and on the process of conversion to Catholic truth have placed the Church forever in his debt. The volumes which treat of these subjects, and which deal with the work of practical apologetic, represent the best and the characteristic thought of the most distinguished convert of the nineteenth century. They are far superior to his writings on the subject of papal infallibility.

Yet, on this happy occasion of the Newman centenary, I believe that it will be not only helpful but actually almost necessary to consider this weakest section of Newman's teachings. Newman has suffered what is for him the supreme indignity of becoming fashionable. Far more indiscriminate praise than really critical study has been given to his writings. Modern Catholic literature has tended to make a hero of Newman, and has endeavored to justify rather than explain his contentions.[1] As a result his attitude towards the Vatican Council's definition of papal infallibility has been put on a level with the rest of his teachings.

The effect has been most unfortunate. Some Catholics, and not a few of those outside the true Church, have been led to accept on the authority of Newman what, in the last analysis, is an imperfect and inexact statement of the conciliar doctrine. Furthermore the rest of Newman's teachings have, in a certain measure, been eclipsed. They have been made to look like what was, objectively, the least acceptable portion of his doctrine.

So, on the occasion of this twofold jubilee, the hundredth anniversary of Newman's entrance into the true Church of Jesus Christ and the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Vatican Council, it will be interesting to review the teachings of Newman on the subject of

[1] For every critical and discriminating study like Dr. Benard's *A Preface to Newman's Theology* there are half a dozen works which becloud the ideas of Newman through their very anxiety to eulogize him.

papal infallibility and to examine the process in which these views were formulated and expressed. If the student is enabled to see something of the emotional strain under which Newman labored during the course of the Vatican Council discussion and to understand what he thought of the issues involved in the definition, he will be in a position to appreciate the injustice that is done to Newman by those indiscriminate admirers who place his infallibility teachings on a level with his other doctrines, and to realize the impossibility of accepting Newman's teachings on this one point as representative of Catholic truth.

BEFORE THE COUNCIL

Prior to the Vatican Council Newman frequently acknowledged his acceptance of a doctrine of papal infallibility. What Newman regarded as an absolute enunciation of the doctrine was found in the original text of his *Discourses on University Education.*

> Deeply do I feel, ever will I protest, *for I can appeal to the ample testimony of history to bear me out,* that in questions of right and wrong, there is nothing really strong in the whole world, nothing decisive and operative, but the voice of Him, to whom have been committed the Keys of the Kingdom, and the oversight of Christ's flock. That voice is now, as ever it has been, a real authority, *infallible* when it teaches, prosperous when it commands, ever taking the lead wisely and distinctly in its own province, adding certainty to what is probable and persuasion to what is certain. Before it speaks, the most saintly may mistake; and after it has spoken, the most gifted must obey.[2]

The *Apologia pro Vita Sua,* written in 1864, contains yet another expression of Newman's belief in papal infallibility. "It is," he tells us, "to the Pope in Ecumenical Council that we look, as to the normal seat of Infallibility."[3]

Yet by all means the most important feature of Newman's view

[2] Newman cites this passage in a letter to the *Guardian,* written in September, 1872. It had been included in the 1852 edition of the *Discourses on University Education,* but was left out of the definitive edition of 1859. The letter to the *Guardian* is printed in *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman,* by Wilfrid Ward (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1912), II, 558 f.

[3] *Newman's Apologia pro Vita Sua. The two versions of 1864 and 1865 preceded by Newman's and Kingsley's pamphlets,* with an introduction by Wilfrid Ward (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), p. 347.

of papal infallibility was his absolute insistence that this doctrine should be treated as a matter of mere theological opinion. A detailed statement of Newman's thought on the quality of the assent due this thesis is found in a letter to Dr. Edward Bouverie Pusey.

> Applying this principle [that a man may be obliged to believe a doctrine on grounds either of faith or of "religiousness"] to the Pope's Infallibility, (N.B. this of course is mine own opinion only, *meo periculo*) a man will find it a religious duty to *believe* it *or* may safely *disbelieve* it, in *proportion* as he thinks it probable or improbable that Church might or will define it, or does hold it, and that it is the doctrine of the Apostles. For myself, (still to illustrate what I mean, not as arguing) I think that the Church *may* define it (i.e. it possibly may turn out to belong to the original *depositum*), but that she will not ever define it; and again I do not see that she can be said to hold it. She never can simply *act* upon it, (being undefined, as it is) and I believe never has;—moreover, on the other hand, I think there is a good deal of evidence, on the very surface of history and the Fathers in its favour. On the whole then I hold it; but I should account it no sin if, on the grounds of reason, I doubted it.[4]

Writing to Renouf in 1868 Newman repeated his basic contention. "I hold the Pope's Infallibility," he stated, "not as a dogma, but as theological opinion; that is, not as a certainty, but as a probability."[5] In a letter written on June 27, 1870, nine days after the Vatican Council had issued its definition, he offers the same assertion. "For myself, ever since I was a Catholic, I have held the Pope's infallibility as a matter of theological opinion."[6]

It must be remembered that the chief cause of Newman's fierce opposition to William George Ward, and to Archbishop Manning and the others who advocated a definition of papal infallibility, is his quite emphatic insistence that the doctrine be left on the level of a mere theological opinion. It is perfectly true that he differed from the Archbishop of Westminster and from the other proponents of the Holy Father's prerogative on questions concerning the limits and the exercise of the Church's inerrancy. Still, he did not

[4] Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 221. The letter was written March 23, 1867.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 236.

[6] *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, by John Henry Cardinal Newman (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1896), II, 304.

resent their statement of the doctrine of infallibility in a way that differed from his own. What moved him to bitter and continued anger was his opponents' contention that the thesis on papal infallibility was not a matter of mere theological opinion at all. His polemic was directed primarily, not against an exaggerated or an extremist notion of papal infallibility, but against its presentation or definition as Catholic dogma.

A strange letter from Newman to Ward, written May 9, 1867, brings out this most important element in Newman's attitude towards the thesis. He accepts with serenity the fact that Ward's teachings on infallibility differ sharply from his own. Newman's basic contention is that these differences are unimportant and inevitable. He is infuriated because Ward persists in viewing these differences as important. He could look with equanimity on statements contradicting his own tenets on the subject of the Holy Father's infallibility as long as these statements were presented as opinions which could be accepted or rejected freely. He is intolerant and indignant when such teachings are offered as dogmatic truth.

> Let me observe then that in former years, *and now,* I have considered the theological differences between us as unimportant in themselves; that is, such as to be simply compatible with a reception both by you and by me of the whole theological teaching of the Church in the widest sense of the word teaching; and again now, and in former years too, I have considered one phenomenon in you to be "momentous," nay, portentous, that you will persist in calling the said unimportant, allowable, inevitable differences, which must occur between mind and mind, not unimportant, but of great moment. In this utterly uncatholic, not so much opinion as feeling and sentiment, you have grown in the course of years, whereas I consider that I remain myself in the same temper of forbearance and sobriety which I have ever wished to cultivate.

His charge against Ward is that "you are doing your best to make a party in the Catholic Church, and in St. Paul's words are dividing Christ by exalting your opinions into dogmas." The letter ends on that note of harshness which Newman seemed to reserve for those who differed from him on the question of papal infallibility.

> I protest then again, not against your tenets, but against what I must call your schismatical spirit. I disown your intended praise of

me, viz. that I hold your theological opinions in "the greatest aversion," and I pray God that I may never denounce, as you do, what the Church has not denounced.[7]

Newman's own attitude towards the theological details of the doctrine on papal infallibility is quite clearly expressed in a letter to Mr. Henry Wilberforce, written July 21, 1867. In this letter he reveals himself as not greatly concerned about the extent and the subject of ecclesiastical inerrancy. The only matter of moment to him is the fact that the Church itself is infallible. He holds himself bound to accept on divine faith only what is universally taught and universally believed. He acknowledges that the arguments set forth in favor of papal infallibility are not such as to convince him that this doctrine falls into the class of those truths which have been expounded and accepted always and everywhere within the Church. It is Newman's contention that, should the doctrine of papal infallibility really belong to the divine message, the purity of his own faith is saved by the fact that he believes it implicitly in accepting as the revealed word of God everything thus presented by the Catholic Church. Thus Newman's stand did not involve any denial on his part that the doctrine of papal infallibility is actually a part of divine public revelation. He was perfectly willing to admit that this teaching was probably included in God's message to mankind. His whole polemic was directed towards withholding from the doctrine of papal infallibility anything more than an implicit assent of divine faith. Explicitly he would concede to it only the status of an opinion.

The pertinent passage, although somewhat long, is far too important to be neglected by one who seeks to understand Newman's attitude towards the Vatican definition.

For myself I have never taken any great interest in the question of the limits and seat of infallibility. I was converted simply because the Church was to last to the end, and that no communion answered to the Church of the first ages but the Roman Communion, both in substantial likeness and in actual descent. And as to faith, my great principle was: "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum.*" So I say now—and in all these questions of detail I say to myself, I believe whatever the Church teaches as the voice of God—and this or that particular inclusively, *if* she teaches this—it is this *fides implicita* which is our comfort in these

[7] Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 232 f.

irritating times. And I cannot go beyond this—I see arguments here, arguments there—I incline one way today another tomorrow—on the whole I more than incline in one direction—but I do not dogmatise—and I detest any dogmatism where the Church has not clearly spoken. And if I am told: "The Church has spoken," then I ask when? and if, instead of having anything plain shown me, I am put off with a string of arguments, or some strong words of the Pope himself, I consider this a sophistical evasion, I have only an opinion at best (not faith) that the Pope *is* infallible, and a string of arguments can only end in an opinion—and I comfort myself with the principle: "Lex dubia non obligat"—what is not taught universally, what is not believed universally, has no claim on me—and, if it be true after all and divine, my faith in it is included in the *implicita fides* which I have in the Church.[8]

Objecting to the practice of proposing the doctrine of papal infallibility as a dogma, although he was ingenuously ready to admit that it might be numbered among those truths included in the deposit of divine public revelation, the full force of Newman's wrath was turned, long before the actual convening of the Vatican Council, upon those who were urging that the Council define papal infallibility as a dogma. As early as November 10, 1867, we find Newman complaining of the "intrigue, trickery, and imperiousness" of those who favored a definition of the Holy Father's infallibility. This strong language was occasioned by Archbishop Manning's Pastoral.

Here is the Archbishop in a Pastoral or Pamphlet putting out extreme views—getting it read to the Pope, and circulating that the Pope approved of it—all with a view of anticipating and practising upon the judgments of the Bishops, when they meet for a General Council. Of course what the General Council speaks is the word of God—but still we may well feel indignant at the intrigue, trickery, and imperiousness which is the human side of its history—and it seems a dereliction of duty not to do one's part to meet them.[9]

Newman's personal contribution to the campaign against the definition against infallibility in the days before the opening of the Council included his encouragement and support of pamphlets by Fr. Ignatius Ryder and by Mr. Peter le Page Renouf. Fr. Ryder's brochure was entitled *Idealism in Theology* and it was meant to

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 234 f.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 240.

take the form of a personal attack on Mr. William George Ward, whose writings on papal infallibility were understood to have the support of Archbishop Manning. In a letter to Ward, sent on April 30, 1845, Newman asserted that Ryder had written without, as far as Newman knew, receiving even a suggestion from any other person. He claimed that "it was written simply and entirely on his [Ryder's] own idea, without any suggestion (as far as I know) from anyone here or elsewhere."[10] Somewhat different is Newman's account of the matter to Canon Walker, in a letter written on May 11, 1867.

> My own share in it is this—that I thought it was good generalship for various reasons directly to attack Ward, not in the first place his opinions. I wanted him to show from Ward's character of mind how untrustworthy he was . . . [11]

Ryder had foolishly characterized himself as a Gallican. Newman will not condemn even this absurdity. For a Review in which such writers as the infamous Acton sought to turn Catholics away from the Vicar of Christ, Newman can find no harsh words. The only vehemently bitter expressions he is able to form during all this period of conflict are directed against the proponents of the Holy Father's infallibility.

> As to his [Ryder's] professing himself, not in any *true* sense, but in the sense people sometimes injuriously use the word, a Gallican, he *wished* to say what he has said—and I confess *I* have a great impatience at being obliged to trim my language by conventional rule, to purse up my mouth, and mince my words, because it's the fashion. And as to the *Home and Foreign,* I detest the persecuting spirit which has pursued it.[12]

The situation becomes openly ridiculous when we find Newman inveighing against the proponents of infallibility because one of their number, a Jesuit, had presumed to answer Renouf in the very tone which Newman admitted Renouf himself had used.[13] A sharp attack on the doctrine of papal infallibility received Newman's support. A sharp and decisive rejoinder to that attack drew only his lofty disapproval. Acerbity was acceptable, but only in anti-infallibilist writings.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 224. [11] *Ibid.*, p. 229. [12] *Ibid.* [13] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 297 f.

An outstanding characteristic of Newman's attitude to the question of papal infallibility prior to the Vatican Council is his unrelenting and violent aversion for the proponents of the definition. One can search in vain through his writings of this period for one scant word of approval, for one admission that they might have had some not-too-outrageous reason for believing that the doctrine should be defined. For some reason or other Newman seemed to regard it as a sacred duty to oppose the projects of his Metropolitan. Writing about Ryder's pamphlet to Fr. St. John, who was then in Rome, Newman speaks thus about the Archbishop.

> As to clamour and slander, whoever opposes the three Tailors of Tooley Street [Manning, Ward, and Vaughan] *must* incur a great deal, must suffer—but it is worth the suffering if we effectually oppose them . . . [14]

Newman considered that, in opposing Archbishop Manning and his followers, he was fighting a "formidable conspiracy, which is in action against the theological liberty of Catholics,"[15] and men "making a Church within a Church, as the Novatians of old did within the Catholic pale."[16] The doctrines against which Ryder was encouraged to write were characterized as "the *ὕβρις ὀρθίων κνωδάλων*," (the wantonness of rearing beasts), and as "the arrogant *ipse dixits* of various persons who would crush every opinion in theology which is not theirs."[17]

DURING THE COUNCIL

The first session of the Vatican Council was held on December 8, 1869. Two weeks later the Rector, the Dean, and ten of the Professors of Louvain's great theological faculty addressed to the Council a petition that the Fathers should define as a dogma of faith the doctrine that "when he prescribes to the universal Church of Christ in solemn definition that some dogma is divinely revealed and to be received with divine faith, or when he condemns some assertion as contrary to divine revelation, that the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, cannot err." The Louvain petition proudly listed the names of the glorious lights of the ancient faculty who had held this doctrine, naming James Latomus, John Driedo, Ruard Tapper, Jodocus Ravestyn, John Hessels, William Lin-

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 154 f. [15] *Ibid.*, p. 230. [16] *Ibid.*, p. 233. [17] *Ibid.*, p. 241.

danus, Martin Rythovius, Cornelius Jansen the Bishop of Ghent, Thomas Stapleton, William Estius, John Malderus, and Christian Lupus.[18] On January 7, 1870, all the Bishops of Belgium, led by Archbishop Dechamps of Malines, presented the Louvain petition to the Council.[19] The Louvain action rendered impossible, once and for all, any serious contention that the world of scholarship was opposed to the definition.

During the month of January, 1870, petitions for and against the definition of papal infallibility were circulated among the members of the Council.[20] It soon became apparent that the great majority was in favor of some definition. Newman was reacting to these events when he sent to Bishop Ullathorne the letter around which centered all of his public statements on the Vatican definition during the time the Council was in session.

On January 20, 1870, Bishop Ullathorne despatched to Newman a letter which included some penetrating observations on the Council, the statement of his conviction that it "will ultimately do a good work for the Church," and a declaration of his decision to "put hand to no petitions or propositions on this side or that." Newman answered on January 28 with what he considered "one of the most passionate and confidential letters I ever wrote in my life."[21] Evidently his ordinary did not consider it completely confidential, because he promptly showed it to four English Bishops, all of them friends of Newman. One of these, William Joseph Clifford, Bishop of Clifton, the man who had served Newman's first Mass and who remained his most devoted friend in the English hierarchy, asked and obtained from Bishop Ullathorne permission to take the letter home with him. When he returned the letter in the morning, he surprised and annoyed Bishop Ullathorne by announcing that he had made a copy of the document for himself. When copies of the letter were shown around Rome some time later, Bishop Ullathorne accused Bishop Clifford of having given it abroad. Bishop Clifford solemnly denied the charge, and claimed that no one could

[18] Cf. *Acta et Decreta Sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum Collectio Lacensis* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1890), VII, cols. 942 f.

[19] Cf. *ibid.*, col. 942. [20] Cf. *ibid.*, cols. 923 ff.

[21] Cf. *The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne*, by Dom Cuthbert Butler (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, 1926), II, 56 f.; 59.

have seen or obtained a text of his copy. There the matter rests to this day.[22]

Newman's letter contained a bitter and powerful protest against the actions of the leaders of the Majority at the Council. The Council itself is accused of "infusing into us by the accredited organs of Rome and its partisans (such as the *Civiltà,* the *Armonia,* the *Univers,* and the *Tablet*) little else than fear and dismay." Through the action of the Council "No impending danger is to be averted, but a great difficulty is to be created." Newman contended that all Catholics believed in the Pope's infallibility, but that the proposed definition was a test of faith. Disclaiming any possibility of difficuty for himself, he declares that "I cannot help suffering with the various souls which are suffering, and I look with anxiety at the prospect of having to defend decisions which may not be difficult to my private judgment, but which may be most difficult to maintain logically in the face of historical facts." He complains that "an aggressive insolent faction" should be allowed "to make the heart of the just to mourn, whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful," and informs his Ordinary that "some of the best minds" are reacting, among other ways, by becoming "angry with the Holy See for listening to the flattery of a clique of Jesuits, Redemptorists, and converts." He adverts to "the store of pontifical scandals in the history of eighteen centuries" and indicates the "blight" which is falling upon certain Anglican ritualists at even the prospect of the definition. He so far forgets himself as to declare that what the infamous and scurrilous anti-Catholic lecturer Murphy had inflicted upon the Church, the distinguished journalist, M. Veuillot, was indirectly bringing upon it now, presumably through his advocacy of the definition.

The depth and bitterness of his feelings on the subject may be gathered from the final paragraph of the letter.

> With these thoughts before me, I am continually asking myself whether I ought not to make my feelings public; but all I do is to pray those great early Doctors of the Church, whose intercession would decide the matter—Augustine and the rest—to avert so great a calamity. If it is God's Will that the Pope's infallibility should be defined, then it is His blessed Will to throw back 'the times and the moments' of that triumph which He has destined for His kingdom; and I shall feel I have but to bow my head to His adorable, inscrutable Providence.[23]

[22] Cf. *ibid.,* pp. 61 f.

[23] *Ibid.,* pp. 58 f.

Naturally enough Newman's letter to Bishop Ullathorne was considered sensational. On March 14, *The Standard,* an English newspaper, published a report that Newman had written to his Bishop "stigmatising the Promoters of Papal Infallibility as an insolent, aggressive faction."[24] Newman had apparently kept only a very imperfect copy of his letter, and he was under the impression that the words attributed to him had not entered into its composition. Acting on that assumption, he wrote to the *Standard* on the following day disavowing the use of the terms attributed to him. He took the opportunity, however, to make the following pronouncement.

> That I deeply deplore the policy, the spirit, the measures of various persons, lay and ecclesiastical, who are urging the definition of that theological opinion, I have neither the intention nor wish to deny; just the contrary. But, on the other hand, I have a firm belief, and have had all along, that a Greater Power than that of any man or set of men will overrule the deliberations of the Council to the determination of Catholic and Apostolic truth, and that what its Fathers eventually will proclaim with one voice will be the Word of God.[25]

Two days later the reporter who had made the statement attributing the expression "insolent, aggressive faction" to Newman returned to the case and reaffirmed his belief that the words had actually been employed. On March 22, Newman wrote again to the *Standard,* acknowledging that its reporter had been correct in his statement. This time he insisted that when he had spoken of the faction, he had "neither meant that great body of Bishops who are said to be in favour of the definition of the doctrine, nor any ecclesiastical order or society external to the Council." Apparently still relying on the bad copy, and forgetting that they had been classed, along with Redemptorists and converts, as components of a clique engaged in flattering the Holy Father, Newman solemnly announced: "As to the Jesuits, I wish distinctly to state that I have all along seperated them in my mind, as a body, from the movement which I so much deplore." The "faction" turns out to be "a collection of persons drawn together from various ranks and conditions in the Church."[26] Later Newman released the text of the

[24] *Collectio Lacensis,* VII, col. 1514 n.

[25] *Ibid.,* col. 1514.

[26] *Ibid.,* col. 1515.

greater part of his letter to the *Standard*. It was published in that journal on April 6.

On the whole Newman seemed strangely pleased about the whole affair. Writing on March 27 to a Sir John Simeon he rejoiced that he had made the mistake about the content of his own letter. The mistake had given him the opportunity to publicize his views twice, once in correcting what he took to be another's error, and once in the process of acknowledging his own.[27] His only fear seemed to be that some one would make his communication the occasion for a counter demonstration in favor of the definition. "If it leads to some counter demonstration, it will be very sad," wrote Newman to his friend De Lisle.[28] On more than one occasion, he asserted that he believed the definition impossible. He rejoiced to hear from Simeon that a protest against the definition would be largely signed, and expressed his desire for such a lay movement to De Lisle.

His condemnation of the leaders in the fight for the definition became more virulent than ever. "Nothing can be worse," he writes, "than the conduct of many in and out of the Council who are taking the side which is likely to prevail."[29] These leaders "have been taking matters with a very high hand and with much of silent intrigue for a considerable time."[30] Even the despicable writings of such as Acton can be explained by Newman as "the retributive consequence of tyranny."[31] Writing on the subject of the definition to David Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry, like Bishop Clifford both an intimate friend of Newman and a vigorous opponent of the Majority policy, he declares that he "cannot bear to think of the tyrannousness and cruelty of its advocates—for tyrannousness and cruelty it will be, though it is successful."[32]

One of the most amazing factors in Newman's opposition to the definition during the time of the Council was his repeated conviction that he and his followers ought to act in this debate as though they were themselves gifted with infallibility. He expresses this sentiment once in the letter to De Lisle, and again in a letter to Fr. Whitty. He thus expresses himself in the latter communication.

[27] Cf. Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 291 f. [28] *Ibid.*, p. 293. [29] *Ibid.*, p. 283.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 284. [31] *Ibid.*, p. 285. [32] *Ibid.*, p. 289.

One can but go by one's best light. Whoever is infallible, I am not; but I am bound to argue out the matter and to act as if I were, till the Council decides; and then, if God's Infallibility is against me, to submit at once, still not repenting of having taken the part which I felt to be right, any more than a lawyer in Court may repent of believing in a cause and advocating a point of law, which the Bench of Judges ultimately give against him.[33]

In this case we have either an inept analogy, or a real index of a mistaken attitude on the part of Newman. A lawyer may argue a case before the highest tribunal. In the event that the decision is given against him, he is of course bound to accept that decision. But in no case is he bound to think that the court has decided correctly. He can still be convinced that his own side was the right one, and he can legitimately hope that at some future date the tribunal will incline towards the views which he has defended. There is no legitimate parallel between this case and that of a man who has taken a side against which an infallible dogmatic decision of the Catholic Church is issued. It is unfortunate that Newman imagined that such an analogy was valid.

In the letter to Fr. Whitty, Newman set forth what seem to have been his strongest reasons against the procedure of the Majority in the Council. Basically he argued against what he considered undue haste in the formation of the decision. It was his contention that "It is enough for one Pope to have passed one doctrine (on the Immac. Concept.) into the list of dogmata."

Passing to what he regards as specific reasons against the definition of papal infallibility by the Council, Newman adduces four points. The first of these is merely one of the cardinal principles of the old Gallicanism. The advocates of the definition are warned that they "must not flout and insult the existing tradition of countries." He denies that the traditions of Ireland and England are on the side of papal infallibility, and insists that what he terms Ultramontane views are comparatively recent both in those countries and in France and Germany. In voicing this opinion Newman manifested, as perhaps nowhere else, the spectacular intellectual weakness of his own cause. He appeals to what is at best a highly suspect theological principle, and, in branding the "Ultramontane" views as "recent" he showed little knowledge of the history of scholastic theology.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 295.

The second point alleged in this letter consists in a rehash of the old attack against the promotors of the definition. This time the particular charge is that they had kept the other members of the Council from knowing about their purpose to work towards the definition. "I declare," wrote Newman, "unless I were too old to be angry, I should be very angry." He recollects a statement attributed to poor Msgr. Talbot to the effect that what made the definition of the Immaculate Conception such an acceptable thing was the fact that it opened the way towards a definition of the Holy Father's infallibility. Newman professed himself shocked at the thought and, meditating "on such crooked ways," he turned to the consideration of our Lord's warning about scandal. Never once did it seem to enter his mind that there was even a faint chance that his own conduct in the affair might possibly have given scandal.

The third point is interesting. It was Newman's contention that the intense theological study which had preceded the *Ineffabilis Deus* "had brought Catholic Schools into union about it, while it secured the accuracy of each." He believed that each of the two schools of thought which had previously existed on the subject of our Lady's Immaculate Conception "had its own extreme points eliminated, and they became one, because the truth to which they converged was one." Newman seemed to assert that the only means of doctrinal progress was along the Hegelian lines of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. He apparently imagined, that when two groups are opposed on some issue, the ultimate resolution can come only through a sort of compromise, in which the "extreme" points of both opposing theories are abandoned while all the contestants unite in their adherence to a middle position. He seems not to have considered the possibility of a situation in which two parties might debate, and one turn out to have defended a truth which the other attacked.

The final argument adduced in the letter to Fr. Whitty takes the form of a protest against the definition on the grounds that it will be "dated," as meant merely to give support to the Syllabus. Furthermore he finds that it is inexpedient for England since its very prospect has proved disquieting to the ultra pontifical Mr. Gladstone,

and to a certain unsavory, convent-baiting politico named Newdegate.[34]

AFTER THE COUNCIL

On July 18, 1870, the Vatican Council adopted and promulgated the constitution *Pastor aeternus* containing the Catholic definition of papal infallibility. To Newman, who had hoped against hope that the definition would never be made, the act of the Council came as a stunning blow. It was not long however before he manifested the attitude which he was to adopt towards the new definition.

At first he refused adamantly to accept the definition as a *de fide* pronouncement. It remained for him in the status of an opinion. The acts of a Council, he contended, do not seem certainly binding until they are promulgated at the termination of that gathering. Before the end of the Council, things could be expected to right themselves.

Again, he thought that nothing more had been defined than what he had always believed. His position stands out clearly in a letter he wrote on August 8, 1870.

> It is too soon to give an opinion about the definition. I want to know what the Bishops of the minority say on the subject, and what they mean to do. As I have ever believed as much as the definition says, I have a difficulty in putting myself into the position of mind of those who have not. As far as I can see, no one is bound to believe it at this moment, certainly not till the end of the Council. This I hold in spite of Dr. Manning. At the same time, since the Pope has pronounced the definition, I think it safer to accept it at once. I very much doubt if at this moment—before the end of the Council, I could get myself publicly to say it was *de fide*, whatever came of it—though I believe the doctrine itself.[35]

Less than a week after the definition had been made by the Council, Newman had confided his attitude to one of his friends. "I saw the new definition yesterday," he wrote, "and am pleased at its moderation—that is, if the doctrine in question is to be defined

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 295 ff. The remarks about the letter to Fr. Whitty do not, of course, describe Newman's considered teaching on doctrinal development, as set forth in the *Essay*.

[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 308 f.

at all. The terms are vague and comprehensive; and, personally, I have no difficulty in admitting it."[36] The old passion for admitting the doctrine exclusively as an opinion appears even in this letter. Newman sets himself to inquire whether or not the definition comes to him "with the authority of an Ecumenical Council." He answers this question in the negative. The authority of an Ecumenical Council is certainly accorded only to those doctrines which Councils proclaim with moral unanimity, according to Newman. At the moment when the Vatican Council proclaimed the doctrine of papal infallibility it did not possess, as far as he was able to judge, the moral unanimity which would have made it necessary for all Catholics to accept its definition with the assent of divine faith. All of definition's claim to be a *de fide* pronouncement was said to hinge upon the future conduct of the Minority Bishops, on later sessions of the Council, and finally upon the reception accorded the conciliar definition by "the whole body of the faithful."

Newman was careful to state that, even as the proposition stood, and by reason of the authority of the assembly which had proclaimed it, the definition had a high claim upon the belief of Catholics. "Even as it is," he wrote, "if I were called upon to profess it, I should be unable, considering it came from the Holy Father and the competent local authorities, at once to refuse to do so. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that there are reasons for a Catholic, till better informed, to suspend his judgment on its validity."[37] As far as he was concerned, even after July 18, 1870, the doctrine of papal infallibility remained an opinion in the last analysis, even though he was quite cheerfully ready to acknowledge that it was a highly probable opinion.

Later he was willing to accord it the status of a dogma, but only under conditions which could be made to justify his previous stand. Had he not expressed himself as not too greatly concerned with questions about the seat and the limits of infallibility? Was not his own favorite and ultimate organ of infallibility the consent of the universal Church, the factor described in the phrase *"Securus judicat orbis terrarum,"* the expression so intimately connected with his own entrance into the true Church? Well, this could be the

[36] *Difficulties of Anglicans,* II, 301. [37] *Ibid.,* pp. 301 f.

effective agent for constituting the doctrine of papal infallibility as a Catholic dogma.[38]

After all there was no other way of accepting the definition as a dogma consistent with his principles. It would be absurd to take the Pope's word as a *de fide* profession of his own infallibility. According to Newman the Roman Pontiff's infallibility had hitherto been merely a matter of opinion, and one who is only probably infallible can certainly not issue a definitive doctrinal jugment on his own authority. The Council was a broken reed, since, apart from any other consideration, it had never been formally closed. Only the "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*" is left, and "This indeed is a broad principle by which all acts of the rulers of the Church are ratified." "In this passage of my private letter," Newman later explained, "I meant by 'ratified' brought home to us as authentic. At this very moment it is certainly the handy, obvious, and serviceable argument for our accepting the Vatican definition of the Pope's Infallibility."[39]

Newman's original position in the infallibility controversy had been in favor of treating this doctrine as an opinion. It was basically on this point that he lashed out against his opponents before the Council, and it was with this in view that he deplored the attempts at definition within the Council and for a time refused to acknowledge the *de fide* status of the teaching even after the Council had spoken. Finally, after there could be no doubt concerning the judgment of the great body of the faithful, he found a means for reestablishing the domain of opinion in this field. The instrument that he employed was his beloved doctrine of "minimizing." Newman asserted that the Church "has ever shown the utmost care to contract, as far as possible, the range of truths and the sense of propositions, of which she demands this absolute reception [of divine faith]."[40] As for the Church's own pronouncements, according to Newman's theory, "She speaks only when it is necessary to speak; but hardly has she spoken out magisterially some great general principle, when she sets her theologians to work to explain her meaning in the concrete, by strict interpretation of its wording, by the illustration of its circumstances, and by the recognition of exceptions, in order to make it as tolerable as possible, and the

[38] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 372. [39] *Loc. cit.* [40] *Ibid.*, p. 320.

least of a temptation, to self-willed, independent, or wrongly educated minds."[41]

The dogmatic pronouncements with which minimizing is concerned fall into two classes. Some are positive statements of doctrine. Others are negative in form, presented as condemnations of teaching judged inacceptable by the Church. For all practical purposes, the meaning of any proposition in either class must be determined by theologians, which decisions may be accurate, but are certainly never binding.

The negative judgments of the Church, qualifying some proposition as heretical, erroneous, or the like, are primarily commands issued to Catholics to avoid these propositions in teaching. The judgment about the meaning of the condemned doctrine belongs to the theologian, and hence, according to Newman's minimism, to the domain of opinion. The affirmative propositions, on the other hand, with the exception of those dealing directly with the Godhead or with our Lady and the Saints "are but general, and so far, in consequence, admit of exceptions in their actual application—these exceptions being determined either by other authoritative utterances, or by the scrutinizing vigilance, acuteness, and subtlety of the *Schola Theologorum*."[42]

Such was the doctrine set forth by Newman in the famed *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*. Unfortunately the rancor which he had always felt towards the leaders in the movement for the definition manifests itself in the *Letter* in such a way as to make it very tiresome reading . Newman never loses an opportunity for an expression of bitterness towards a group which included, after all, the leading Prelates of Christendom. He has only expressions of courtesy for the bumbling politician who had ventured to attack the Church of God. He has only expressions of sympathy for those opponents of the definition who had left the Church. His harsh words are reserved for a group that included men like Archbishops Spalding and Manning. In 1872 he had not a word to retract from the violent letter he had sent to Bishop Ullathorne.[43] In the *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* he withdraws this lamentable document only to the extent of asserting that it had not been meant for the public eye.[44] Indeed, the *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* seems to have

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 321. [42] *Ibid.*, p. 334. [43] Cf. Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 559.
[44] *Difficulties of Anglicans*, II, 301.

been considered by Newman himself as an attack on Archbishop Manning as much as a defence of the Catholic body against the libels of Gladstone.[45] It is characteristic of the relations of the two great English churchmen that, when the then Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda, Cardinal Franchi, wrote to Archbishop Manning on the subject of censurable propositions in the *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk,* Manning hastened to reply begging that no public action be taken against Fr. Newman, and giving as his first and principal reason the assertion that "The heart of the revered Fr. Newman is as right and as Catholic as it is possible to be."[46]

Conclusion

As a whole, Newman's stand on the doctrine of papal infallibility was doctrinally inexact and unfortunate in its influence. In his controversial efforts against the definition, he seems never to have adverted to the factor which rendered this conciliar act, not only beneficial, but morally necessary to the Church of God. The great ecclesiologists of the Golden Age, almost without exception, had insisted upon the infallibility of the Holy Father's definitive dogmatic pronouncements. They had pointed to the fact that his decisions were irreformable of themselves, whether he spoke in concert with the rest of the apostolic college, or alone in his capacity as the supreme teacher of the true Church of Jesus Christ. The long list of theologians cited by the Louvain faculty in its petition to the Vatican Council covers only a portion of the body of classical ecclesiologists who taught this doctrine. Men like St. Robert, Francis Suarez, Francis Sylvius, and John Wiggers considered this teaching as a part of the deposit of Catholic faith.

The infamous Gallican Articles darkened the theology of the eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries. The Gallicans did not simply deny papal infallibility, but they would recognize as infallible only those pronouncements which the Holy Father makes in concert with the Catholic bishops throughout the world. The confusion caused by this politico-theological doctrine manifested itself in a relatively poor quality of teaching *De Romano Pontifice* in mid-nineteenth century theology. Only an occasional ecclesiologist like Patrick Murray of Maynooth managed to achieve the clarity and adequacy which had been characteristic of this tract in

[45] Cf. Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 402.

[46] Butler, *op. cit.*, II, 101.

former years.[47] As a result of the Gallican teachings there had been a regress rather than a progress in an important portion of theology. The definition of papal infallibility was meant to remove this harm from the Church. Unfortunately Newman seemed unaware of the immediate issue and of its chief implications.

Acton, who was in constant touch with Newman during the time of the infallibility debates and who was sympathetic to Newman's attitude, seems to have considered the great Oratorian's explanation of the Vatican decrees as being, for all intents and purposes, an emptying of their content. Writing to "dear Mr. Gladstone" in December 1874, Acton made no secret of the fact that it was his wish "to make the evils of Ultramontanism so manifest that men will shrink from them, and so explain away or stultify the Vatican Council as to make it innocuous."[48] After the *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* had appeared, Acton, apparently still unwilling to do other than "explain away" the Vatican definitions, announced to Lady Blennerhassett that "Newman's conditions would make it possible, technically, to accept the whole of the decrees."[49] Even before the Council had made its definition, Newman had written to Mr. O'Neill Daunt, contending that "if anything is passed, it will be in so mild a form, as practically to mean little or nothing."[50]

The most unfortunate effect of this attitude on the part of Newman has been the emergence of an opinion that, after all, the Vatican definition of papal infallibility was of little import. This impression has been spread, not so much by Newman's own writings, which of themselves are not very convincing on this point, as by Wilfrid Ward's official biography of Newman. Ward's *Life,* one of the few really influential modern Catholic works in the English language, sees the issues only through the eyes of Newman himself. Newman's opponents are, for Wilfrid Ward, only the "untheological school,"[51] and the persons who have the temerity to question Newman's position are "good but not far-seeing people,"[52] or "men whose education was not equal to their piety."[53]

[47] Murray, the outstanding ecclesiologist of the nineteenth century, is among those accused by Newman of attempting "to bring in a new theory of Papal Infallibility." (Cf. Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 152 f.).

[48] *Selections from the Correspondence of the First Lord Acton* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1917), I, 147.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 155. [50] Ward, *op. cit.*, I, 299. [51] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 282.

[52] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 279. [53] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 280.